

**ABBOTT EVELYN, DUNCKER  
MAX**

**THE HISTORY OF  
ANTIQUITY, VOL.  
3 (OF 6)**

Max Duncker

**The History of Antiquity, Vol. 3 (of 6)**

«Public Domain»

**Duncker M.**

The History of Antiquity, Vol. 3 (of 6) / M. Duncker — «Public Domain»,

## Содержание

CHAPTER I.	5
CHAPTER II.	11
CHAPTER III.	26
CHAPTER IV.	37
CHAPTER V.	45
CHAPTER VI.	56
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	59

# Max Duncker

## The History of Antiquity, Vol. 3 (of 6)

### CHAPTER I. THE CAMPAIGNS OF TIGLATH PILESAR II

In the course of the ninth century B.C. the power of Assyria had made considerable progress. In addition to the ancient dependencies on the upper Zab and the upper Tigris, in Armenia and Mesopotamia, the principalities and cities on the middle Euphrates had been reduced, the region of the Amanus had been won. Cilicia had been trodden by Assyrian armies, Damascus was humbled, Syria had felt the weight of the arms of Assyria in a number of campaigns; the kingdom of Israel and the cities of the Phenicians had repeatedly brought their tribute to the warlike princes of Nineveh; at length even the cities of the Philistines and the Edomites could not escape a similar payment. Tiglath Pileasar I. had seen the great sea of the West, the Mediterranean; three centuries later Bin-nirar III. received the tribute of all the harbour cities of the Syrian coast, the great centres of trade on this sea. Nor was it to the West only that the power of the Assyrians advanced. Shalmanesar II. and Bin-nirar III. gained the supremacy over Babylon, the ancient mother-country of Assyria. Each offered sacrifices at Babylon, Borsippa, and Kutha; while to the North-west the power of Assyria extended beyond Media as far as the shores of the Caspian Sea.

The successors of Bin-nirar III. were not able to sustain their power at this height. Shalmanesar III. (781-771 B.C.) had again to fight against Damascus and Hadrach (in the neighbourhood of Damascus<sup>1</sup>); in his short reign of ten years he marched six times against the land of Ararat (Urarti). Assur-danil III. (771-753 B.C.), the successor of Shalmanesar III., also fought against Hadrach and Arpad (now Tel Erfad, near Hamath<sup>2</sup>). He had, moreover, to suppress disturbances which had broken out on the upper Zab in Arrapachitis (Arapha), and in the land of Guzan (Gauzanitis) on the Chaboras. In the reign of Assur-nirar II. (753-745 B.C.) there were risings in Assyria, even in Chalah, the metropolis.<sup>3</sup> But the prince who succeeded Assur-nirar II. on the throne of Assyria, Tiglath Pileasar II., was able not merely to raise the kingdom to the position which it had occupied under Shalmanesar II. and Bin-nirar III., but to make it a predominant power over a still wider circuit.

The armies of Shalmanesar II. had invaded Media; among the tribute brought to him by the land of Mushri we found camels with two humps, buffaloes, (yaks) and elephants. After a successful campaign against Babylon, which he undertook immediately after his accession, Tiglath Pileasar led his army to the table-land of Iran, and forced his way to the East.<sup>4</sup> A tablet discovered at Chalah, which gives a summary of Tiglath Pileasar's achievements from the first to the seventeenth year of his reign, mentions the districts subjugated in this direction. It is a long list, beginning with the land of Namri.<sup>5</sup> The districts of Parsua, Zikruti, Nisaa, and Arakuttu are mentioned,<sup>6</sup> and the enumeration concludes with districts in the wilds of Media.<sup>7</sup> The king defeated the numerous warriors of this

---

<sup>1</sup> The older Zachariah mentions the land of Hadrach beside Damascus and Hamath, Zech. ix. 1, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Fifteen miles to the north-west of Aleppo the ruin-heaps at Tel Erfad mark the site of the ancient Arpad; Kiepert, "Z.D.M.G." 25, 665.

<sup>3</sup> A document has been preserved from the reign of Assur-nirar, belonging to the year 747 B.C., regarding the lease of a piece of land; Oppert et Ménant, "Docum. Juridic." p. 151.

<sup>4</sup> The list of rulers represents him as marching to the stream, *i. e.* to the Euphrates, immediately after his accession, and afterwards to the land of Namri, *i. e.* to the Zagrus.

<sup>5</sup> G. Smith reads Zimri.

<sup>6</sup> Nissi in G. Smith, "Disc." p. 260, but in frag. 4 Nissa.

<sup>7</sup> So according to G. Smith [who reads Likruti].

region; "60,500 of their people, children, horses, asses, mules, oxen, and sheep without number I carried away."<sup>8</sup> Such are the words of the inscription, which proceeds: "I took possession of the land of Namri anew, and the land of Parsua." With these regions thirteen districts already mentioned are again enumerated. "Zikruti in rugged Media I added to the land of Assyria; the cities I built up anew; in them I placed warriors of Asshur, my lord, and people whom my hand had taken captive. I received the tribute of Media, of Ellip, and all the princes of the mountains to Bikni; horses, asses, mules, oxen, sheep without number. My general, Assurdainani, I sent into rugged Media towards the rising of the sun. He brought back 5000 horses, oxen, sheep without number."<sup>9</sup>

According to this inscription Tiglath Pileasar, on his first campaign against Iran, which we may place, on the authority of the list of rulers, in the year 745 or 744 B.C.,<sup>10</sup> though he failed to reach Bactria and the Indus, forced his way into the eastern regions of Iran as far as the further shore of lake Hamun. The meaning of the names Nisaa, Zikruti, and Arakuttu is hardly doubtful. Nisaa must denote the region or district of Nisæa in the east of Media. Zikruti,<sup>11</sup> which is mentioned together with Nisæa, may be the name of the Sagartians of Herodotus, the Aḡagarta of the inscriptions of the Achæmenids, a race mentioned by Herodotus among the tribes of the Persians; they were settled or wandered to the east of the latter. Arakuttu gives us the Semitic form of the name of the Harauvati of the Persian inscriptions, the Haravaiiti of the Avesta, the Arachoti of the Greeks. The Arachoti were settled in the river-valley of the Arachotus (now Arghandab), which falls into lake Hamun, to the east of the river. But Tiglath Pileasar did not maintain his supremacy on the table-land of Iran to this extent. In the enumeration of the conquered districts of the second campaign the names Nisaa and Arakuttu are wanting, while Zikruti, Parsua, and Madai (Media), and the tribute of Media, which must therefore have been obtained by a new campaign of the general of Tiglath Pileasar, are brought into prominence. The second campaign of the king was therefore limited to the western regions of Iran. At a later time, in the ninth year of his reign (737 B.C.), he once more marched into the land of Media.<sup>12</sup> A second inscription says, in summary, that Tiglath Pileasar imposed tribute on the "land of Parsua" and the "city of Zikruti," which was dependent on the land of the Medes, and on the princes of the land of Media as far as the land of Bikni.<sup>13</sup>

When Tiglath Pileasar ascended the throne Nabonassar (747-734 B.C.) had been king of Babylon for two years, according to the canon of Ptolemy. Babylonia no longer possessed the extent of country once given to her by Hammurabi, and which we may ascribe to her during the numerous wars carried on with Assyria from the middle of the fifteenth century, and even at the date of Shalmanesar II. and Bin-nirar III. Either through the preponderance which Assyria had obtained over Babylon after the middle of the ninth century, or from other causes, we find several independent principalities on the lower course of the Euphrates after the middle of the eighth century; the Assyrian inscriptions mention as such, Bit Sahalla, Bit Silan, Bit Dakkur, Bit Amukan, and Bit Yakin at the mouth of the Euphrates, on the shore of the Persian Gulf. So far as we can discover from the monuments, Tiglath Pileasar was at war with Babylonia in the very first year of his reign.<sup>14</sup> Dur Kurigalzu, the old border fortress of Babylon against Assyria, Sippara, and other cities of the land of Kardunias on the river or canal Ukni, are mentioned, and the priests of Bit Saggatu or Bit Zida, *i. e.* of the chief temples of

<sup>8</sup> Ll. 29-33 in G. Smith, "Disc." p. 260; Ménant, "Annal." pp. 142, 143.

<sup>9</sup> Ll. 34-42, in G. Smith, "Disc." p. 261; Ménant, *loc. cit.* 143. The words "I possessed anew" are wanting in G. Smith; cf. Lenormant, "Z. Ægypt. Sprache," 1870, s. 48 ff. The statement about the subjugation of Bit Hamban and the regions which follow, ll. 34-37, is repeated in the inscription in Layard, pp. 17, 18, l. 17; in Ménant, *loc. cit.* 139. The statement about the campaign of Assurdainani is repeated in frag. 4, p. 271 in G. Smith, *loc. cit.*

<sup>10</sup> This gives 745-744 B.C.: Bildanil. To the land of Namri; cf. frag. 3 in G. Smith, "Disc." p. 269.

<sup>11</sup> Ménant translates, "city of Zikruti;" G. Smith's rendering does not give this description in this passage (p. 260), but on p. 271.

<sup>12</sup> G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 279; Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 146.

<sup>13</sup> L. 17 in Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 139.

<sup>14</sup> Above, p. 2, note 4.

Babylon and Borsippa, together with the priest of Nergal, who bring gifts to Tiglath Pileasar; we hear of 10 talents of gold, and 1000 talents of silver, received by Tiglath Pileasar in the first year of his reign.<sup>15</sup> In the summary of his achievements (on the tablet of Chalah) the king says that he has taken Dur Kurigalzu, that he has offered sacrifice at Sippara, Nipur, Babylon, Borsippa, Kutha, and Ur, that in the beginning of his reign he ruled from Dur Kurigalzu to Nipur.<sup>16</sup> The king of Babylon, against whom he fought and whom he compelled to open the gates of his fortresses and of Babylon, is not mentioned by Tiglath Pileasar. We must assume, from the canon of Ptolemy, that it was Nabonassar who bowed himself before the weight of the arms of Assyria. Yet the obedience of Babylon was not secured. Fragments of the detailed annals of Tiglath Pileasar inform us that his general again fought against the Babylonians, that he himself again conquered a city which the Babylonians had taken, that in the region of Tel Assur he sacrificed to Merodach the god of Tel Assur.<sup>17</sup> An inscription of Chalah narrates that Tiglath Pileasar laid waste Bit Amukan and Bit Sahalla, and took their kings Nabu-sabzi and Zakiru prisoners; that he besieged king Kinziru in Sapiya (Sape), his capital, and added to Assyria Pillutu on the border of Assyria and Elam; that he received the tributes of the kings of the Chaldæans, of Balasu, the son of Dakkuri, of Nadin of Larrak, and Merodach Baladan, the son of Yakin, the king of the sea coast.<sup>18</sup> The large tablet tells us more at length. "Pillutu on the borders of Elam I added to Assyria; the Chaldæans I removed from thence and placed in the midst of Assyria. The warriors of Nabu-sabzi, the son of Silani, I defeated under the walls of his city of Sarrapani, and I crucified him before the great gate of his city. Five thousand five hundred of his people I took captive; his sons, his daughters, his gods I carried away: his city and the cities round about it I destroyed and burnt. Zakiru, the son of Sahalli, and his chieftains I captured; I put them in irons and brought them to Assyria; 5400 of the people of Bit Sahalla I captured; I laid waste all the districts of Bit Sahalla and united them to Assyria. The numerous army of Kinziru, the son of Amukan, I defeated before the great gate of his city, Sapiya; I besieged him and overthrew all his cities. Bit Silan, Bit Amukan, Bit Sahalla, I have laid waste throughout their whole extent; I received the tribute of Balasu, the son of Dakkuri, and of Nadin of Larrak; Merodach Baladan, the son of Yakin, the king of the sea-coast, was overcome by the fear of Asshur, my lord: he came to Sapiya and kissed my feet, and I received his tribute."<sup>19</sup>

The canon of Ptolemy represents Nadius as succeeding Nabonassar of Babylon in the year 733 B.C. Is the Nabu-sabzi of Bit Silan whom Tiglath Pileasar defeats near the city of Sarrapani the king Nadius of the canon; and ought his name to be altered in the canon to Nabius? According to the canon Nadius reigned only two years (733, 732 B.C.); the campaign of Tiglath Pileasar, which ended in the conquest and execution of Nabu-sabzi, must therefore have taken place in the year 732 B.C. After the conquest of Nabu-sabzi, as the inscriptions told us, Tiglath Pileasar subjugates Kinziru of Bit Amukan, when he had besieged Sapiya, his capital; in this city he receives the homage of Merodach Baladan. The list of rulers places the campaign against Sapiya in the year 731 B.C. In the canon of Ptolemy, Nadius is succeeded by a joint rule: from the year 731 to 727 B.C. Chinzius and Porus reign over Babylon. Is the Kinziru of Bit Amukan the Chinzius of the canon?

After the subjugation of Merodach Baladan, king of the sea-coast, *i. e.* the coast of the Persian Gulf, Tiglath Pileasar's dominion extended over the whole region of the Euphrates. He assures us that "he laid waste the land of Chaldæa throughout its whole extent," and "received tribute from all the Chaldæans;" that "he possessed the whole land of Kardunias (Babylonia), and was lord over it;"<sup>20</sup> and

<sup>15</sup> Frag. 1, 2 in G. Smith, "Disc." pp. 266, 267.

<sup>16</sup> Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 139.

<sup>17</sup> The list of rulers inserts a second campaign of Tiglath Pileasar to the land of the stream in the year 737 B.C.; frag. 8, 11. 18, 19, 52-55 in G. Smith, *loc. cit.* pp. 277, 280, 281.

<sup>18</sup> Ll. 12-19 in G. Smith, "Disc." pp. 255, 256.

<sup>19</sup> Ll. 14-28 in G. Smith, "Disc." pp. 258-260.

<sup>20</sup> G. Smith, *loc. cit.* pp. 255, 258.

with perfect truth, for an inscription of king Sargon tells us, that Bit Amukan, Bit Dakkur, Bit Silan, Bit Sahalla, Bit Yakin form the whole of the land of the Chaldæans.<sup>21</sup> Tiglath Pileasar calls himself "king of Asshur, king of Babylon, king of Sumir and Accad;" he claims the full title of the kings of Babylon. The names of the principalities of Chaldæa are obviously taken from their dynasties. Nabusabzi is called the son of Silan, and his land Bit Silan; Merodach Baladan is the son of Yakin, and his land is Bit Yakin. Shalmanesar II., as we saw (Vol. II. p. 239), spoke of Israel as Bit Omri, *i. e.* the house of Omri. The Chinzirus of the canon of Ptolemy enables us to assume that Tiglath Pileasar after the defeat of Kinziru of Bit Amukan placed this Kinziru as a vassal-king or viceroy over Babylon, a proceeding which recurs often enough in the proceedings of the kings of Asshur towards conquered principalities and lands.

The canon of Ptolemy does not make Chinzirus the sole king of Babylon. From 731 B.C. to 727 B.C. Chinzirus and Porus are said to have reigned together – a joint sovereignty, of which this is the only instance in the canon. Strikingly enough their two reigns end in the same year, and this, 727 B.C. is the very year in which, according to the Assyrian canon, Tiglath Pileasar's reign is brought to a close. In the excerpt from Berosus' list of the kings of Babylon, given by Polyhistor, of which Eusebius has preserved some very scanty fragments, the 45 kings who reigned over Babylon for 526 years are followed by "a king of the Chaldæans, whose name was Phul."<sup>22</sup> If the Babylonians named Tiglath Pileasar Phul in their list of kings, and if Porus in the canon of Ptolemy is a mistake for Polus (Pul), the Babylonians, in order to conceal their dependence on Assyria, must have placed their countryman before the stranger, the vassal king before the real king in their series of rulers.

The Hebrew Scriptures tell us that Phul of Asshur marched against Israel; Menahem of Israel paid Phul a tribute of 1000 talents of silver, and the king of Assyria returned into his land. Then Ahaz of Judah sent messengers to king Tiglath Pileasar of Asshur to save him out of the hand of Rezin, king of Damascus, and Pekah, king of Israel. Pekah had put to death Pekahiah, the son of Menahem, after a reign of two years, and seated himself on the throne. Tiglath Pileasar listened to Ahaz and came and carried away a part of the Israelites to Assyria, and Hoshea set on foot a conspiracy and slew Pekah and became king in his place.<sup>23</sup> The inscriptions of Tiglath Pileasar mention among the princes who brought him tribute "Minihimmi (Menahem) of Samirina (Samaria),"<sup>24</sup> and also "Jauhazi (Ahaz) of Judah;"<sup>25</sup> a fragment informs us that Tiglath Pileasar reached the borders of Bit Omri, *i. e.* of Israel (Vol. II. p. 239). "Pakaha (Pekah) their king they had slain;" so Tiglath Pileasar continues in this fragment, "I put Husi (Hoshea) to be king over them."<sup>26</sup> The inscription also speaks, in this place, of sending or carrying away to Assyria, but it is in such a mutilated condition that more accurate knowledge is impossible. Still it is abundantly clear from this fragment that the king of Assyria, who received tribute from Menahem of Israel and then marched against Israel when Pekah had ascended the throne, was one and the same prince, Tiglath Pileasar. We might assume a double payment of tribute on the part of Menahem, a payment to Phul and a second payment to Tiglath Pileasar, but this is met by the fact that the monuments of Assyria know no king of the name of Phul, and the continuity of the lists of Assyrian Eponyms does not allow us to insert a king of the name of Phul between Tiglath Pileasar and his predecessor Assur-nirar II. The error of the Book of Kings in ascribing the first campaign against Menahem of Israel to Phul, and the second, in support of Ahaz against Pekah of Israel, to Tiglath Pileasar, is most easily explained, if we admit the hypothesis given above,<sup>27</sup> that the Babylonians gave the name Phul to Tiglath Pileasar as their supreme king.

---

<sup>21</sup> Oppert, "Dur Sarkayan," p. 20; Ménant, "Annal." pp. 160, 181.

<sup>22</sup> Vol. II. p. 27; Euseb., "Chron." I, p. 26, ed. Schöne.

<sup>23</sup> 2 Kings xv. 19, 29; xvi. 7-9; 1 Chron. v. 26.

<sup>24</sup> G. Smith, "Disc." p. 277.

<sup>25</sup> G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 263.

<sup>26</sup> G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 284.

<sup>27</sup> It is due to E. Schrader.

Tiglath Pileasar held the western regions of the table-land of Iran in dependence. He ruled as king over Babylonia, over the whole region of the Euphrates down to the borders of Elam and the shore of the Persian Gulf; and in the North also he led the armies of Assyria to victorious campaigns. His tablets tell us that he incorporated with Assyria the land of Nairi, *i. e.* the region between the upper Zab and the upper Tigris, that he defeated king Sarduarri of Ararat (Urarti), who had rebelled against him, took his camp and besieged him in his city of Turuspa; that he set up "an image of his majesty" there, and laid waste the land of Ararat far and wide.<sup>28</sup> Afterwards Sarduarri and Sulumal of Milid (Melitene) and Kustaspi of Kummukh (Gumathene), each trusting to the power of the other, rebelled; these he defeated, and took captives to the number of 72,950 men. In the middle of the battle Sarduarri rode away: he (Tiglath Pileasar) took the seal from his neck, his neck-band, his royal chariot, and his couch, and dedicated them to Istar of Nineveh.<sup>29</sup> The inscriptions further inform us that Kustaspi of Kummukh, Sulumal of Milid, and Vassurmi of Tubal gave tribute to Tiglath Pileasar, and when Vassurmi was negligent in the service of Assyria and did not appear before his face, Tiglath Pileasar sent his chief captain against him and set up Chulli to be king of Tubal in Vassurmi's place.<sup>30</sup> The list of rulers puts the first war of Tiglath Pileasar in the year 743 B.C., the second campaign against Ararat and the princes leagued with him in the year 735 B.C.

Of the successes of Tiglath Pileasar in Syria we shall hear below. When he received the tribute of Hamath, Byblus, and Israel before the ninth year of his reign, *i. e.* in the year 738 B.C., Zabibieh, the queen of the Arabs, also paid tribute.<sup>31</sup> When he had overthrown Damascus, Israel, and the Philistines (732 B.C.), he fought against Samsieh, the queen of the Arabians, in the region of Saba,<sup>32</sup> as we are told in a fragment of his annals, and took from her 30,000 camels, and 20,000 oxen. In the inscriptions which sum up the achievements of the king we are told that he subjugated the Nabatu (who must be sought to the south on the lower Euphrates), the Hagaranu (the Hagarites), the Pekudu (Pekod);<sup>33</sup> that the distant tribes of Tema (the Temanites) and Saba (the Sabæans), on the borders of the setting sun, heard of his power, and submitted to him, brought gold, silver, and camels, and kissed his feet.<sup>34</sup> A fragment of the annals repeats this statement; on the borders of the land of the setting sun they heard of his power and his victories and submitted to him.<sup>35</sup> Hence it was not only migratory tribes in the neighbourhood of Syria and the lower Euphrates, like the Pekod and Hagarites, whom Tiglath Pileasar forced to recognise his supremacy and pay tribute: his armies must have advanced from Syria and the lower Euphrates to the interior of Arabia, if the Temanites (I. 324) and the tribes of the South, "on the borders of the setting sun," *i. e.* the tribes of the South-west, the Sabæans, in "fear of his power and his victories," sent him tribute.

If the armies of Assyria reached no further than Deraeah in the interior of Arabia, it was still a vast stretch of country which they traversed in the eighteen years in which Tiglath Pileasar sat on the throne. Yet they also reached Lake Hamun and the land of the Arachoti in the East on the further side of the Persian Gulf. On the terrace of Chalah which supported the royal citadels Tiglath Pileasar built himself a palace to the south of the house of Shalmanesar II. It is the central palace of the explorers. The great inscription on one of the marble slabs found in the floor in the ruins tells us that he built his royal abode in the midst of Chalah for his glory; that he placed it higher above the bed of the Tigris than the palaces of his predecessors; that he adorned it with costly decorations, and placed in it the tributes of the kings of the Chatti, the princes of the Aramæans and Chaldæans, who had

<sup>28</sup> Frag. 4, ll. 12-23 in G. Smith, "Disc." pp. 271, 272.

<sup>29</sup> Frag. 5 in G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 272, 273.

<sup>30</sup> The large inscription, lines 57-59, 64, 65 in G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 263.

<sup>31</sup> Frag. 8, l. 33 in G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 279.

<sup>32</sup> Frag. 13, l. 3; cf. frag. 10, l. 16; frag. 12, l. 19 in G. Smith, pp. 283, 285, 286.

<sup>33</sup> Tablet of Chalah, l. 6 in G. Smith, p. 254; stone of Chalah, ll. 6, 8, 13, p. 254.

<sup>34</sup> Stone of Chalah, ll. 53-55 in G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 262.

<sup>35</sup> Frag. 13, *loc. cit.* p. 286.

bowed their might at his feet<sup>36</sup> The inscription begins with the words, "Palace of Tiglath Pilezar the great king, the mighty king, the king of the nations, the king of Assyria, the high priest of Babylon, the king of Sumir and Accad, the king of the four quarters of the earth, the mighty warrior, who in the service of Asshur his lord has marched through the lands, swept over them like a storm, treated them as captives; the king, who, under the protection of Asshur, Samas, Merodach, the great gods, his lords, ruled from the sea of Bit Yakin as far as Bikni, and from the sea of the setting sun (*i. e.* the Mediterranean) as far as Muzur (Egypt)."<sup>37</sup> The second shorter inscription says in a similar manner: "Palace of Tiglath Pilezar the great king, the mighty king, the king of the nations, the king of Assyria, the king of Babylon, the king of Sumir and Accad, the king of the four quarters of the earth, the mighty warrior, who in the service of Asshur, his lord, has trodden to pieces like clay all who hated him, has washed them away like a flood and made them into shadows – the king who marched out under the protection of Nebo and Merodach, the great gods, and reigned from the sea of Bit Yakin to the land of Bikni, to the rising sun, and from the sea of the setting sun to Muzur, who possessed all lands from the setting to the rising and ruled over their kingdoms."<sup>38</sup> Of this proud palace but scanty ruins remain. One of the successors of Tiglath Pilezar, who ascended the throne of Assyria 46 years after him, caused the slabs on which Tiglath Pilezar had depicted his campaigns and victories together with the explanatory inscriptions above them, to be taken away, in order to have them smoothed, and placed when filled with pictures of his own achievements in the house which he built in the south-west corner of the terrace of Chalah. This successor died during the building of his house. This is clear from the fact that slabs and inscriptions of the palace of Tiglath Pilezar, intended for the new structure, have been found partly in the remains of the old building and partly in the new structure, with the defacement partially carried out.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Ll. 67-86 in G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 264, 265.

<sup>37</sup> G. Smith, "Disc." ll. 1-4, p. 256, 257.

<sup>38</sup> G. Smith, *loc. cit.* p. 254.

<sup>39</sup> The three private documents on the sale of a slave, the loan on the mortgage of a field, and the interest and security for an advance, which are placed in the time of Tiglath Pilezar III., are given in Oppert et Ménant, "Docum. Juridiq." p. 153 *sqq.*

## CHAPTER II. THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL

The overthrow of the house of Omri had not raised the power of the kingdom of Israel. Jehu, it is true, sent tribute to Shalmanesar II. king of Assyria (842 B.C.). But in spite of this subjection to the great king on the Tigris, neither Jehu nor his son Jehoahaz was in a position to repel the attacks of the princes of Damascus, Hazael and Benhadad III.; the whole region to the East of the Jordan, the land of Gilead, had to be conceded to Damascus after the most cruel devastation of that district and of all Israel. It was the distress into which Bin-nirar III. of Asshur brought Damascus which first afforded respite to Israel in the last years of Jehoahaz, though tribute for this service also had to be paid to Assyria (803 B.C.). His successor, king Joash (798-790 B.C.) was now able to wrest from Damascus at least those cities which his father had lost, and the son of Joash, Jeroboam II. (790-749 B.C.), the fourth sovereign of the house of Jehu, succeeded in gaining the upper hand over Damascus, in completely reconquering the land of Gilead, and inflicting heavy blows on Hamath. The land which he conquered from Hamath he retained; the Books of Kings mention the brave deeds of Jeroboam II., how "he set up again the borders of Israel, from the land of Hamath to the sea of the plain." During his long and powerful reign – he sat on the throne for 41 years<sup>40</sup> – agriculture was developed, trade became again active, and, as it seems, very lucrative. In Samaria, the metropolis, there were splendid houses, the inhabitants of which lived in magnificence and luxury.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> 2 Kings xiv. 23; Amos vi. 2, 14.

<sup>41</sup> Amos iii. 11; vi. 4-8; Hosea xii. 9. That the commencement of Jehu and Athaliah must be placed at the year 843 B.C., has been shown Vol. II. p. 234. The Books of Kings give 165 years from the accession of Athaliah to the fall of Samaria, and 143 years from the accession of Jehu to the same time. Hence the synchronism which they observe for corresponding reigns in Israel and Judah cannot be correct at any rate for the last half-century of this time, and varying statements with reference to these reigns show that this fact was known to those who made these observations. Moreover, the canon of the Assyrians puts the fall of Samaria in the year 722 B.C., from which it follows (843-722=121), that 44 years in excess for Judah, and 22 for Israel, have been added. Thus we are driven to hypotheses for the period from 843 to 722 B.C., as well as for the period 953-843. In the traditional numbers at least in one reign there has been abbreviation, not extension, as in the previous period. Samaria was taken in the ninth year of Hoshea, the seventh of Hezekiah (2 Kings xvii. 6; xviii. 10). Hoshea therefore ascended the throne in 730, Hezekiah in 728 B.C. But the facts narrated in a fragment of the annals of Tiglath Pileasar, that he reached the borders of Bit Omri, that he conquered Gaza and made Hoshea king (frag. 11, in G. Smith, "Disc." p. 284), fall, according to the list of rulers, in the year 734 B.C. Hoshea's accession must, therefore, be placed in the year 734 B.C. Hoshea's predecessor, Pekah, is said to have reigned 20 years. If Hoshea ascended the throne in 734 B.C., Pekah, according to this statement, must have ascended it in 754 B.C., and Pekahiah, the son of Menahem, who only reigned two years, in 756. But the fragment of the annals of Tiglath Pileasar, which mentions the payment of tribute by Menahem, puts this payment immediately before the ninth year of Tiglath Pileasar, *i. e.* before the year 737 B.C.; frag. 8, in G. Smith, *loc. cit.* In 738, therefore, Menahem was still on the throne; and his death cannot have taken place before this year. Thus the interval between Menahem's death and Hoshea's accession, which the Books of Kings reckon at 22 years, is reduced to four years; Pekah cannot have reigned 20, but only two or three years. Menahem's death in 738 B.C., fixes the beginning of his reign, which lasted 10 years, at 748 B.C. Before him, Zachariah, the son of Jeroboam, and Shallum, reigned seven months. Jeroboam's reign must, therefore, have ended in 749 B.C. It lasted 41 years, and must, therefore, have begun in 790 B.C. Thus of the 82 years and seven months, which the Books of Kings reckon for Israel from the accession of Jeroboam to the capture of Samaria, 68 only remain. We must place Jeroboam from 790 to 749, Zachariah and Shallum in 749, Menahem's accession in 748, his death in 738; Pekahiah from 738 to 736, Pekah from 736 to 734, in which year he is succeeded by Hoshea. In the list of the kings of Judah, 90 years are enumerated from Uzziah's (Azariah's) accession to the fall of Samaria. Before Hezekiah, whose accession as already observed is to be put in 728 B.C., comes Ahaz with 16 years; before Ahaz, Jotham also with 16 years. Hence Jotham's predecessor, Uzziah-Azariah, died in 760, and Ahaz began to reign in 744. But the eighth fragment of the annals of Tiglath Pileasar, already mentioned, puts the defection of the 19 districts of the land of Hamath to Azariah not long before the year 738 B.C.; other fragments mention contacts with Azariah, which, according to the list of rulers, belong to the years 742 or 740 B.C. Hence Azariah was alive at any rate as late as 740 B.C.; the interval given by the Books of Kings between Uzziah-Azariah and the accession of Hezekiah is reduced from 32 to 12 years. The reigns of Jotham and Ahaz must therefore be reduced from 16 years each to six years each; and the 90 years from Uzziah's accession to the fall of Samaria to 70 years. The parallelism with the reigns in Israel remains undisturbed. Jotham reigned from 740 to 734, Ahaz from 734 to 728. In the year 734 Ahaz is attacked by Pekah, who, as we have seen, reigned from 736 to 734, and before the accession of Ahaz had attacked his predecessor Jotham (2 Kings xv. 37). The campaign of Tiglath Pileasar against Pekah took place, according to the list of the rulers, in the year 734 B.C. The same list puts the war of Tiglath Pileasar against Damascus in the years 733 and 732 B.C. The great inscription of Tiglath Pileasar which narrates his deeds down to the seventeenth year of his reign, *i. e.* down to 729 B.C., mentions shortly before

In Judah the reign of Joash, whom the high-priest Jehoiada placed on the throne in the year 837 B.C., again fully established the worship of Jehovah in opposition to the favour which his grandmother Athaliah had shown to the worship of Baal. Amaziah, the son of Joash, maintained his throne against the murderers of his father; his arms were successful against the Edomites, but failed against Israel. When he also was slain by conspirators, the people, in the year 792 B.C., raised his son Uzziah (Azariah) to the throne. Uzziah was only 16 years of age at the time of his accession, but young as he was he learned well how to rule, and the length of his reign allowed him to see the fruit of his labours. The Chronicles say of him: "He loved husbandry; he had husbandmen and vinedressers in the mountains, and dug many wells in the desert, for he had many cattle in the low country and in the plain."<sup>42</sup> Uzziah was also a brave warrior. Against the Philistines he obtained greater successes than fell to the lot of any of his predecessors, including even Saul and David, greater than those won by any of his successors. He took Gath, the prince of which David had once served; he gained Jabneh and conquered Ashdod, and destroyed the walls of this city. The loss of Gath and Ashdod limited the league of the cities of the Philistines to Ekron, Ascalon, and Gaza; Uzziah built Jewish cities in the conquered districts,<sup>43</sup> he forced the Ammonites to pay tribute, he completed the subjugation of the Edomites which his father Amaziah had begun, and his fame reached even to Egypt.<sup>44</sup> He rebuilt the harbour-city of Elath on the Red Sea, which the rebellion of the Edomites against Judah had wrested from king Jehoram about the year 845 B.C. (II. 252), placed Jews there, and apparently restored the Ophir trade of Solomon.<sup>45</sup> "He was marvellously helped," say the Chronicles, "till he became strong." Amid such successes Uzziah did not forget that changes would occur, that other times would come. In the second half of his reign<sup>46</sup> he strengthened the walls of Jerusalem with towers at the corner-gate, *i. e.* at the north-west corner, of the city wall, at the valley gate, and at the corner, *i. e.* where the wall of the upper city advances to the west, and caused "engines invented by cunning men to be on the towers and upon the bulwarks of the walls, to throw arrows and great stones withal."<sup>47</sup> The levy of the people was put in order; the fighting men were entered on a register; Uzziah "prepared for the whole army shields and spears, coats of mail and helmets, bows and slinging stones."<sup>48</sup> "And Uzziah did what was right in the eyes of Jehovah as Amaziah his father had done, save that the people

---

the close the tribute of Jauhazi of Judah (in G. Smith, loc. cit. p. 263), and the Books of Kings (II. xvi. 10, 18), mention the journey of Ahaz to Damascus to pay homage there to Tiglath Pileser. This must, therefore, have taken place in 732 B.C.. The synchronism of Jeroboam and Uzziah, which is also always marked at the commencement of the prophetic writings referring to them, is not altered by our assumptions. Uzziah, who ascended the throne at 16 years of age, reigned from 792 to 740; Jeroboam from 790 to 749. From Uzziah's accession up to the accession of Athaliah, the Books of Kings give 75 years; the interval between 843 and 792 gives us 51 years; so that there must have been an abbreviation. This can be assumed most conveniently in the reign of Amaziah, which lasted for 29 years, and includes the years from 797 to 792. In the reign of his father Joash we know that there was a long minority, and the twenty-third year of this reign is mentioned. Of Amaziah's acts, the subjugation of Edom, which he did not complete, comes after the year 803 B.C. Edom's tribute is mentioned under Bin-nirar of Assyria (II. 326). Just as little is the parallelism of Amaziah with Joash of Israel altered by our assumption. As 61 years, *i. e.* eight years too many, were given for Israel from the accession of Jeroboam (790) up to Jehu's accession, eight years must be taken from the reign of Joash, and for his reign, therefore, eight years are left instead of 16, *i. e.* the eight years from 798 to 790. Violent as these assumptions seem as compared with the traditional numbers of the Books of Kings, they are merely given as a forced hypothesis, and at any rate leave the traditional facts undisturbed, while the coincidence, which may be obtained by assuming joint regencies, a first and second reign of Jeroboam II., a first and second Menahem, a first and second reign of Pekah, for the lists of Judah and Israel, alters the tradition without bringing the agreement into harmony with the list of eponyms.

<sup>42</sup> 2 Chron. xxvi. 10.

<sup>43</sup> 2 Chron. xxvi. 6; Zech. ix. 6. As Amos mentions the capture of Gath (vi. 2), and Judah is still to conquer the remnant of Edom (Amos ix. 12), the war against the Philistines must be regarded as one of Uzziah's deeds in arms.

<sup>44</sup> 2 Chron. xxvi. 7; Isa. ii. 7.

<sup>45</sup> 2 Kings xiv. 22. The re-conquest of the Judæan settlement and harbour city, which had been destroyed by the Edomites in their revolt from Judah under Jehoram (II. 252), can have had no other object than to restore the trade connections on the Red Sea. Besides, it is expressly stated (2 Kings xvi. 6): "At the same time (734 B.C.), Rezin again gained Elath for Syria, and drove the Jews out of Elath, and the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there to this day."

<sup>46</sup> This follows from the fact that Amos speaks of the ruined tabernacle of David, and the breaches in its wall (ix. 11).

<sup>47</sup> 2 Chron. xxvi. 15.

<sup>48</sup> 2 Chron. xxvi. 11-14.

still sacrificed and offered incense on the high places" – so we are told in the Books of Kings. The Chronicles add that he sought God as long as the prophet Zachariah lived.<sup>49</sup> Afterwards he had a quarrel with the priests of the temple because he sacrificed with his own hands in the great space of the temple, the holy place (before the Holy of Holies), on the altar in that space intended for incense. David and Solomon had offered incense there before him; the priesthood intended therefore to make good their exclusive claim to every kind of sacrifice as against Uzziah.<sup>50</sup> Uzziah succeeded in raising Judah to the highest point of power and importance, which it reached after the defection of Israel.

Thus after severe tempests the reigns of Jeroboam II. and Uzziah brought to Israel and Judah the restoration of order, power and prosperity. The flourishing condition of agriculture and trade increased the well-being of the people, and produced profits which led the wealthy classes into a misuse of their wealth, into extravagance and luxury. This mode of life, which seldom, in the East especially, fails to accompany gains easily got, was attacked in both kingdoms by a merciless criticism. In Israel and in Judah a careless enjoyment of life was connected not unfrequently with a certain inclination towards the rites of the Syrians. From the time that the house of Jehu ruled in Israel, and Joash ascended the throne of Judah, the favourable feeling towards Syrian rites had ceased, from the throne downwards. With the restoration of more active relations towards the neighbouring nations their example operated with renewed force on the wealthier classes of Israel, and among them, and afterwards no doubt among the people, admission and recognition was thus gained for the religious observances of the Syrians. As the sensual elements in the forms of the gods and the cultus of the Syrians became more marked – as the worship of the deities of procreation and birth became more licentious and debauched, in connection with the increased population, and consequent luxury and dissoluteness in the Phœnician cities (II. 276), as the prostitution became more general, the service of androgynous deities more zealous – as the number of sacred servants, of companions male and female, of eunuchs and men ready to make themselves eunuchs, became larger – as this worship of lust and mutilation grew more disgusting, and the flames on the altar of Moloch rose more frequently – so much the more vigorous, in the circles of the neighbouring nations, whose national and religious life was roused, must have been the aversion and opposition to such licentious practices, to rites of so different a nature, and so strongly at variance with their own faith.

Three centuries before this time, Israel by the foundation of a monarchy had gained rest and security against her nearest neighbours in the East and West, against Moab and Ammon, and the Philistines. After the division the powers of Israel and Judah had hardly sufficed at all times to protect them against their neighbours; and even, at last, against the Damascenes. Serious dangers threatened from a greater distance. Egypt, the country from which in Syria there was naturally the most to fear, had kept within her borders since the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan, as if to secure space and freedom for the development of Israel. Only once in the course of five centuries was this rest broken by the campaign of the Pharaoh Shishak, and then in a very transitory manner. But half a century after this campaign another opponent arose far to the East on the banks of the Tigris, who now had secured a firm footing on the Euphrates, whose armies first trod the north of Syria, and tried their strength in repeated campaigns against Damascus. Ahab of Israel in league with Damascus and other princes of the Syrians succeeded in beating off the first attack; but after him Jehu and Jehoahaz of Israel paid tribute to the kings of Asshur, and though the successors of Bin-nirar III. had to fight in Arrapachitis and Gauzanitis, they repeatedly led their armies against Northern Syria, against Arpad and Hadrach.

However secure men might feel in Israel and Judah in the possession of the position recently obtained under Jeroboam and Uzziah, it could not escape a keener eye that a power had forced its way to the Euphrates, and every moment threatened a renewed attack on Syria which Israel and Judah

---

<sup>49</sup> An older prophet of this name, distinct from the son of Jehoiadah, and perhaps also distinct from the son of Berechiah (Isa. viii. 2), but identical with this Zachariah, if the words of the Chronicles may be explained to mean: "So long as he (Uzziah) listened to Zachariah."

<sup>50</sup> 2 Kings xv. 3; 2 Chron. xxvi 6-21; 1 Kings ix. 25.

were not in a position to resist, even in the favourable position in which for a moment they were situated. Even if Israel and Judah united their forces, which for the moment were excellently arranged, it was scarcely conceivable that they could make any stand against the supremacy of Assyria, if this were expressly directed against Syria. Only in the event of a hearty combination of all the states and tribes of Syria, the Philistines and the Phenicians, Hamath and Damascus, Israel and Judah; only by the union of all Syria under one power, could a sufficient counterpoise be provided to the Assyrian power. But the feeling and tendencies of these states were different, as also was the state of civilisation and religious life; and the thought of such an union never arose among them. Even if it had it could hardly be realised here, or elsewhere in the East, in any other way than by establishing one despotic monarch. Such a form of union would at any rate have required that Israel should give the best she had. Instead of a political impulse which would have united Israel and Judah with Damascus and Hamath, the Phenicians and Philistines, the internal circumstances of Israel and Judah, the opposition to the renewed encroachments of the Canaanitish worship, combined with the threatening position of Assyria, gave a new, peculiar, and lofty flight to the religious development of the Israelites.

In its struggles against the house of Omri the prophetic power was inwardly ripened and strengthened. With the relaxation of persecution the intensity and ecstasy of the prophets must have been relaxed. In the place of the passionate strife came a more peaceful tone, greater calmness, more earnest introspection. Yet the prophetic power was not merely purified, it was also deepened. By degrees, elements which had been developed in other spheres exercised an influence on the prophetic work, on the reflection on the nature and will of Jehovah, and the effort to be absorbed in him. The expression and outlet which religious feeling had found in religious songs, in invocations, and hymns of thanksgiving, praise and penitence, supplied to the prophetic feeling a fuller, broader and more variable background. To the oldest account of the fortunes of Israel, which arose in priestly circles, and of the covenant which his God had once made with him, to the collection and establishment of the law which formed the contents of this covenant, was soon added the second text, which described in a more lively manner the manifestations of the tribal God, his guidance of the patriarchs and forefathers of the nation, and, like the older text, it was for a long time in the hands of the prophets. Even before Joel, at the time when the high-priest Jehoiada was regent for king Joash in Judah (II. 259), urged the nation to repentance and introspection, the hand of a prophet had united those two texts. Penetrated by their contents, he had, as might be expected from his point of view, laid the main stress on the promises and prophecies, on the relation of man to God, on the nature of man, and his duty in life. In this form the books of the fortunes of the patriarchs, of the covenant of Jehovah and Israel, of the promise of protection and blessing in return for the observation of this covenant, must have exercised an especial influence on the circle of the prophets; they showed them the past in the closest relation to the present; they strengthened their conviction that the external relation was insufficient, that the essential point was the internal relation of man to his God.

As a fact the people of Israel had experienced a peculiar fortune. Of the same origin as a part of the Arabian and Syrian tribes and closely allied to them, the Israelites had not followed the same path of development. Branching off from those nearest, and then from their older tribesmen, with whom they had previously pastured their flocks, they grew up into a nation on the borders of Egypt and under Egyptian supremacy; a nation in which nomadic simplicity met with certain influences due to Egyptian culture. Forced back upon their feeling of national independence by the oppression of the Egyptians, the children of Jacob had emancipated themselves from Egyptian dominion, and had embraced with renewed vigour the worship of their tribal God, and at length had won by force of arms an abode among the kindred tribes, to which they now stood opposed as enemies. The tribes of Syria were far before them in culture of every kind, in wealth and adornment of life; the tribes of the desert, the closely related neighbours on the east of the Jordan, did not cease to attack and plunder the cantons of the Israelites; their neighbours on the south coast sought with persistence to subjugate them. Thus the national contrast remained in force, and the fixity of it was favoured

by the nature of the mountain country, the seclusion of many valleys and heights possessed by the Israelites, while these same natural conditions rendered impossible such a thorough entrance into the life of the maritime cities, and the life of Damascus and Hamath, as could lead to the dissolution of the nationality. The fact that Israel, at the time of David and Solomon, obtained the preponderance over their neighbours, tended, together with the national pride, to strengthen the contrast instead of weakening it, and maintained the consciousness of nationality as a great memory. Even from this point of view, starting from the national feeling and consciousness, the prophets could not but oppose the Syrian tribes and their rites, and in this opposition they found the more ready acceptance in Israel, the more thoroughly the consciousness was aroused that the land had been won and maintained in conflict with the tribes to whom this worship belonged. But the conception of the nature of the national deity was far more powerful in the prophets than the sense of nationality. In contrast to the lascivious worship of the powers of nature, the God of Israel was originally conceived as a deity who was alien and opposed to the creative powers of nature. In the sense of this contrast Jehovah was regarded as an exalted and terrible deity, to look on whom brought death; in this feeling the simple conception, which cannot forego the sensuous element, saw Jehovah's manifestation in flame, in the destroying but purifying glow of fire. The aversion to all sensuous nature now rises to its fullest power in the mind of the prophets in opposition to the Syrian rites; their supernatural point of view, forced onward by the struggle and the contrast, disrobed the idea of God of every material element which still adhered to it. How could this supra-terrestrial power, before which all that is earthly is dust and mire, dwell in a frail image made by human hands? The temple at Jerusalem had no image, the greater part of the old places of sacrifice were without any, and among the Hebrews it was well known that the worship of Jehovah without images was the traditional mode of worship. Neither the bull-images of Jehovah, which had been set up at the time of the division of the kingdom in Israel, in contrast to the images of the Syrian gods, though tolerated by the prophets at the time of Ahab and Jehoram, nor any other image of the god, ought to be worshipped. If the divine power is not only supernatural but also purely spiritual, beyond nature and ruling over it; if it is without manifestation in the world of sense; there can be no question of the worship or deification of elementary powers, or the personification of physical processes; the worship of these is nothing but deception and senseless rites. Moreover, the power before which all nature quakes can be but one. Thus, to the prophetic mind, Jehovah from being the tribal God of Israel, beside whom other gods defended their nations, though not so mighty as he, becomes the one and only God. And to them this God is no longer merely the power which rules over nature, no longer merely the jealous and severe God of his nation from whom the first-born must be purchased, who must be worshipped with many sacrifices, and pleasant odours – to the inward emotion, the inward certainty, and conscience of the prophets he is at the same time the highest ethical power. Whatever they in their enlightenment and in their hearts felt to be the just, the good, the highest, is Jehovah's nature. In him were concentrated the moral elements as conceived by the prophets, and nature is no more than the footstool under his feet. He is now the one supernatural, spiritual and moral power, which rules the world, before which earth and mankind disappear. He is pure, holy and sublime; he hates injustice, violence, exaction, avarice, deceit, and oppression of kindred, and looks not on wickedness with favour. His will is just, he will requite every one according to his actions, and will not forget the evil of the evil-doer. What can the holy and just Lord in heaven care for offerings of food, frankincense, and drink? The lips and the heart must be elevated to his greatness, his commands must be kept, and men must make themselves holy as he is holy. The only service of the holy God is a holy and righteous life. Sacrifice is not required, but recognition of God, simplicity, chastity, and moderation.

If from this point of view, to which their own conception had laboriously risen – they had learned to know the ancient God of Israel in his true nature – and following the lead of the sacred Scriptures, the prophets cast a glance on the fortunes and achievements of their nation, – had not Jehovah already announced himself to their forefathers? Had he not by Moses commanded and

established the true worship? Had he not done great things for his people? Had he not led them out of Egypt and given them this beautiful land for a possession? But had Israel been grateful for this? – had he made any return? – had he kept the covenant which Jehovah had made with him, and his law? At the best sacrifices were offered at Jerusalem, prayer was made to bull-images at Dan and Bethel. But how many were there who worshipped Baal, Astarte, and Ashera! How regardless of their duties were the rich, and the judges, how luxurious and dissolute in their lives! Was this the way to fulfil the commands of the just and holy God?

From this arose a peculiar class of ideas. Jehovah had chosen Israel for his people before other nations. He desires to protect him and grant him his favour. But how can he, the pure and holy God, grant protection and defence, if his people live an impure and unholy life? To protect sinners would be against his own nature. Jehovah was a severe and jealous God; was he not to punish the defection from his service, the faithlessness and ingratitude of the nation, with grievous punishment? Must he not visit these wrong-doers with a heavy penalty? The Assyrians were on the Euphrates. From these suppositions, and the conclusion that Jehovah, according to his pure and holy being as well as his severe nature, must punish the error of the people; that he could not allow the breach of the ancient covenant, the defection, the worship of idols, the injustice, and the luxury to remain unvisited, grew up the idea of a great sentence about to be executed on Israel and Judah. Among the prophets this became a settled conviction. But according to their conception, Jehovah is raised far above the weakness and the anger of men. If his people return to him, amend their conversation, and serve him with their lips and their heart, he will in his mercy pardon them, or the punishment which he sends upon them will be merely a purification; the stiff-necked obstinacy of the hard heart he will break; many will fall, but he will spare those who are true to him; and when he has corrected his people by a severe judgment, he will exalt them anew, and take up his abode on Zion.

Filled with these conceptions the prophets came forward soon after the beginning of the eighth century. They are no longer sooth-sayers and seers; they do not predict any more; they do not announce definite facts; they only know what will and must be the consequences of the sinful life of the people: they proclaim a great judgment; they declare what must be done in order to turn aside the wrath of Jehovah. Impelled by inward certainty to ascertain and reveal the nature and will of Jehovah, filled with religious inspiration, and in a tone of deepest earnestness, the prophets give to their utterances an expression of force and fire, which forms a proper sequel to the beautiful beginnings of lyric poetry, as we have learned to know them in the songs of victory, in the strains of thanksgiving and lamentation of the Israelites, in the psalms – a sequel which corresponds to the power and importance of the spiritual movement from which the exhortations of the prophets arise. With unwearied zeal they exhort the people to return to their ancient God and trust in him alone. Then, as Israel's power began to decline after the death of Jeroboam and Uzziah, the view and conception of the prophets becomes higher and higher; the more threatening and dangerous the position of affairs, the greater their influence; and at the time when the political existence of the Israelites was broken down, their religious life is perfected and purified, into a thorough recognition of ethical monotheism.

A man of the kingdom of Judah, Amos of Tekoa, a place not far from Jerusalem, prophesied in Israel in the first decades of the reign of Jeroboam, between 790 and 760 B.C. He calls himself "neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet;" he assures us that he was not a disciple of the prophets, and did not wear the usual garb of a prophet, *i. e.* a poor coarse clothing. He adds that he was a herdsman and a planter of sycamores: "Jehovah took me from following the flock, and said to me; Go and prophesy to my people in Israel."<sup>51</sup> From these prophecies, which he afterwards wrote down, it is plain that the Holy Scriptures, in the form in which the two texts had been united and revised by the hand of a prophet, were familiar to him and present before him; that the prophecies of Joel

---

<sup>51</sup> Amos i. 2; iv. 9.

were known to him.<sup>52</sup> It was in Bethel, the chief place of sacrifice in Israel, that he came forward. There, at the place of the bull-image, he proclaimed the wickedness of this worship, and branded in still stronger terms the moral corruption of the land. In vain had Jehovah uttered warnings by his prophets; the law was not regarded; justice was crooked; the weak were oppressed. No doubt Amos exaggerated his reproaches, but we cannot doubt that the faults he attacked were in existence. The careless he threatened with the destruction which would soon burst upon them if they remained without repentance or improvement. Then would the high places of Isaac be laid waste, and the shrines of Israel destroyed, and Jehovah would rise up with the sword against the house of Jeroboam. The priests of Israel could not endure to hear such utterances. The high priest at Bethel, Amaziah, said to Amos: "Seer, go flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread and prophesy. Prophecy not again any more at Bethel: for it is the king's chapel, and the king's court." Amos answered: "Thou sayest, Prophecy not against Israel, and drop not thy word against the house of Isaac. Therefore thus saith Jehovah: Thy wife shall be an harlot in the city, and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword, and thy land shall be divided by a line; and thou shalt die in polluted land: and Israel shall surely go into captivity forth of his land." Then Amaziah the priest sent to king Jeroboam: "Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel; the land is not able to bear all his words; for he saith, By the sword shall Jeroboam die, and Israel shall be led captive out of his land."

The proclamations of Amos were not directed against Israel alone. He threatens the Damascenes and the Ammonites with vengeance for the devastations they had caused in Gilead (II. 258); the Philistines because they had carried away captives from Judah and sold them (II. 303); the city of Tyre because she put the captives of Judah in the hands of the Edomites; the Edomites because they pursued their brothers (the Judæans) with the sword (II. 252). Nor does he even spare the kingdom of Judah; even there the law of Jehovah is despised, and his ordinances are not kept. But the judgment of Jehovah will descend only on the guilty, and when the day of judgment is over Jehovah will again purify Israel and set up Zion.

"Did I not bring you up from Egypt?" so Amos represents Jehovah as saying; "Did I not lead you forty years in the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorites? Did I not destroy the Amorites before you, who were tall as cedars, and strong as oaks? Did I not raise up prophets from your sons, and Nazarites from your young men?<sup>53</sup> Hear this word, ye who oppress the weak and trample underfoot the poor;<sup>54</sup> ye who stretch yourselves beside the altar on garments taken in pledge, and drink the wine of the condemned in the house of your gods; ye who overpower the just, and make the poor bow down at the gate;<sup>55</sup> who purchase the thirsty for silver, and the helpless for a pair of shoes;<sup>56</sup> who, father and son together, go to one mistress, and say: When is the new moon over that we may sell grain, and the day of rest that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balance for deception. Do men hunt the horse on the rocks, and plough the stone with oxen, that ye may turn justice into poison, and the fruit of righteousness into

---

<sup>52</sup> The date of Amos is fixed not only by the superscription, but by the mention of the house of Jeroboam in his prophecies. Moreover, the desolation caused by the Damascenes in Israel, the campaigns of the Philistines against Judah (II. 252), appear to be in recent remembrance. If the "fallen tabernacle of David, the breaches in its wall," are also mentioned (ix. 11, 12), it is clear that Uzziah, who came to the throne in the year 792 B.C. at an age of 16 years, had not completely restored Judah, that he had not recovered Elath. On the other hand, it is clear that Gath was already taken. Hence Amos cannot have come forward before the tenth or twelfth year of Uzziah, *i. e.* before 782 or 780, according to our computation (p. 18, *note*). The canon of the Assyrians agrees with this in putting the campaign of Bin-nirar to the coast in the year 803 B.C.; and afterwards records the last campaign of the Assyrians to Damascus before the time of Tiglath Pileasar II. in the year 773 B.C.; after which time only contests against Hadrach (772-765) and against Arpad are mentioned (p. 2), which Tiglath Pileasar then resumes in the year 743 B.C. In Amos the Assyrians are still in the back-ground.

<sup>53</sup> Amos ii. 9-12.

<sup>54</sup> Amos viii. 4; v. 12.

<sup>55</sup> Amos ii. 6, 7.

<sup>56</sup> Amos viii. 6.

hemlock?<sup>57</sup> Because ye trample down the weak, and oppress them with burdens, ye have planted pleasant vineyards, and built houses of hewn stone.<sup>58</sup> O ye that are at ease in Zion, ye careless ones in the mount of Samaria, who imagine that the day of destruction is far off, and draw near the seat of violence; who lie on beds of ivory, and stretch yourselves on couches; who eat up the lambs of the flock and the calves of the stall; who chant to the sound of the harp, in order to invent instruments of music like David;<sup>59</sup> who empty your wine cups, and anoint yourselves with the chief oil, and trouble not yourselves for the affliction of Joseph; ye shall not dwell in your houses, and drink the wine out of your pleasant gardens: ye shall go forth into misery, with the first that go captive.<sup>60</sup> Go to Bethel, and transgress; to Gilgal, and multiply transgression. Bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes on the third day; burn thank-offerings, and publish the free will offerings.<sup>61</sup> Seek me not at Bethel, and go not to Gilgal and Beersheba. I hate your festivals, and will not taste your offerings, or look on the thank-offering of your stalled calves. Take from me the noise of your songs, and let me not hear the sound of the harp.<sup>62</sup> Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. Seek good, and not evil, that ye may live: establish judgment in the gate; it may be that Jehovah will have mercy on the remnant of Joseph. Hate the evil, and love the good, so will Jehovah, the God of hosts, be with you."<sup>63</sup>

"But they multiply injustice and robbery in their palaces. The end of my people Israel draws near; I will not overlook it longer in him. I will change your festivals into lamentation, and all your songs into mourning, and will bring sackcloth about your loins. The enemy comes round the land, and tears down the power of Israel, and his palaces are plundered.<sup>64</sup> Go to Calneh, and see, and from thence pass to Hamath the great (II. 317, *supr.* p. 15), and go down to Gath (p. 18); are ye better than these kingdoms, or is your land greater? I raise against you a nation which will force you from Hamath unto the river of the plain.<sup>65</sup> At the time when I avenge the evil of Israel upon him, and the altars of Bethel, the horns of the altar will fall to the ground. I will smite the winter house and the summer house; the houses of ivory shall fall to the ground.<sup>66</sup> The flight shall perish from the swift; the bowman shall not stand, the horseman shall not deliver himself, and the most courageous among the mighty shall flee away naked on that day.<sup>67</sup> All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword, which say: The evil shall not overtake us.<sup>68</sup> But I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob. I will shake them as a man shaketh a sieve, and not a grain shall fall to the ground. The days come when the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed, and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them, and I will plant them fast in the land, which I have given to them, that they be no more pulled out."

Amos had not deceived himself as to the want of inward cohesion in the circumstances of Israel. The days of Jeroboam II. were coming to an end. The power which he had gained for his kingdom, the order he had given to it, were not so firmly fixed that they outlived the founders. His son Zachariah, who ascended the throne in 749 B.C., remained on it for half a year only. He was

---

<sup>57</sup> Amos vi. 12.

<sup>58</sup> Amos v. 11.

<sup>59</sup> Amos vi. 1-7.

<sup>60</sup> Amos v. 11.

<sup>61</sup> Amos iv. 4, 5.

<sup>62</sup> Amos v. 21-23.

<sup>63</sup> Amos v. 14, 15, 24.

<sup>64</sup> Amos iii. 10, 11; vi. 2.

<sup>65</sup> Amos vi. 14.

<sup>66</sup> Amos iii. 14, 15.

<sup>67</sup> Amos ii. 14-16.

<sup>68</sup> Amos ix. 10.

murdered "before the people" by a man of the name of Shallum, the son of Jabesh, who placed himself at the head of a conspiracy, and with him the house of Jehu came to an end in the fourth generation. Shallum seized the throne, but maintained it only a month. Menahem, the son of Gadi, rebelled against him in Tirzah, defeated and slew him, and took his place on the throne (748 B.C.).<sup>69</sup> He met with resistance in the land; internal strife distracted Israel, and loosed all the bonds of order. "The idols have spoken vanity," so we find it in the older Zachariah; "and the diviners have seen a lie, and have told false dreams; they comfort in vain; therefore they went their way as a flock; they were troubled, because they had no shepherd. Mine anger was kindled against the shepherds, and I will punish the goats.<sup>70</sup> I will no more pity the inhabitants of the land, saith Jehovah; but lo! I will deliver the men, every man into his neighbour's hand, and into the hand of his king, and they shall smite the land, and out of their hand I will not deliver them. Three shepherds also I cut off in one month;<sup>71</sup> and my soul loathed them; and I said, I will not feed you: that which dieth, let it die; and that which is to be cut off, let it be cut off, and let the rest eat every one the flesh of another. For lo! I will raise up a shepherd in the land which shall not visit those that be cut off, nor seek the strayed one, nor heal that which is wounded; but he shall eat the flesh of the fat. Woe to the worthless shepherd that leaveth the flock! the sword shall be upon his right arm, and upon his right eye. His arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye darkened.<sup>72</sup> Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars! Howl, cypress, for the cedar is fallen; for the heights are made desolate: howl, O oaks of Bashan; for the steep forest sinketh! Listen to the howling of the shepherds; for their glory is spoiled: listen to the roaring of lions, for the pride of Jordan is desolate.<sup>73</sup> The burden descends on Hadrach, and on Damascus; on Hamath that shall border thereby; on Tyre and Sidon, though it be very wise. Tyre built herself a stronghold, and heaped up silver as the dust, and fine gold as the mire of the streets. Behold, the Lord will take her, and cast her walls into the sea, and she shall be consumed by fire. Ascalon shall see it, and fear; Gaza, and be very sorrowful, and Ekron, for her expectation shall be ashamed; and the king shall perish from Gaza, and Ascalon is uninhabited. A strange race shall dwell in Ashdod, and I will destroy the pride of the Philistines.<sup>74</sup> And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and horses from Jerusalem. But Jehovah shall save them in that day as the flock of his people; they are the stones of a crown lifted up upon his land."<sup>75</sup>

Even earlier, in the last years of the reign of Jeroboam, or the beginning of the reign of his son Zachariah, Hosea, the son of Beer, had received the word. "Yet a little time," such is the word of Jehovah in his lips, "and I will avenge the bloodguiltiness of Jezreel on the house of Jehu (the murder of Jehoram and Jezebel by Jehu, II. 254), and put an end to the kingdom of the house of Israel; and at the same time I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezreel."<sup>76</sup> When Zachariah fell before Shallum, and Jehu's house was destroyed, we find in Hosea, "They chose kings without me (Jehovah), captains of whom I knew nothing." "I will give thee a king in my anger, and take him away in wrath. All your kings shall fall, for none of them call upon me. Israel is a heifer that cannot be tied."<sup>77</sup> The prophet demands with the greatest vehemence that the worship of images shall be given up, and the bull-images at Dan and Bethel (II. 237) removed: that robbery and murder come to an end, that Israel turn to Jehovah; the judgment threatens, and there is no helper but Jehovah.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> 2 Kings xv. 8-15.

<sup>70</sup> Zech. x. 2, 3.

<sup>71</sup> King Zachariah, and then Shallum: the third is the opponent of Menahem who sought to maintain himself in Tipsach (Taanach?).

<sup>72</sup> Zech. xi. 6, 8, 9, 16, 17.

<sup>73</sup> Zech. xi. 1-3.

<sup>74</sup> Zech. ix. 1-6.

<sup>75</sup> Zech. ix. 10, 16.

<sup>76</sup> Hosea i. 4, 5.

<sup>77</sup> Hosea viii. 4; iv. 16; vii. 7; xiii. 11.

<sup>78</sup> Hosea xiii. 4.

"Hear this, ye priests; receive it, house of Israel; and thou, house of the king, take heed thereof," cries Hosea.<sup>79</sup> "When Israel was a child I loved him, saith Jehovah; I called my son from Egypt. In the desert, in the land of great drought, I did know thee.<sup>80</sup> I taught Ephraim to go, taking them by the arm; I drew them with human cords, with bands of love; I took off the yoke from their backs, and laid meat unto them.<sup>81</sup> Israel was an empty vine, but the more that his fruit increased, the more altars did he build; the better his land, the more beautiful pillars did he set up.<sup>82</sup> They made images of their silver according to their knowledge, idols, the work of craftsmen, and said: Let them that sacrifice kiss the calves.<sup>83</sup> They sacrifice on the tops of the mountains, and burn incense on the hills, under oaks, and poplars, and elms, because the shadow thereof is good.<sup>84</sup> I will go after my lovers, saith Israel, the faithless wife, who give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, my oil and my drink; and she knows not that Jehovah increased her corn and sweet wine, and oil, and silver.<sup>85</sup> There is no faithfulness, no love, no knowledge of God in the land. Ye have ploughed wickedness and reaped iniquity, and have eaten the fruit of lies.<sup>86</sup> They practise swearing and lying, and stealing, and adultery, and violence; the priests commit murder on the way to Shechem; they practise all iniquity in Gilgal, and bloodguiltiness is joined to bloodguiltiness.<sup>87</sup> They slay flesh for sacrifice, and eat it.<sup>88</sup> I desire not sacrifice but mercy; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.<sup>89</sup> Therefore in my own time I will take back my corn; I will tear away my wool and my flax from the harlot Israel; and make an end to her festivals, her new moons, her sabbaths, and avenge on her the days of Baal, when she offered incense to them which placed their nose-ring and ornaments upon her, and went after her lovers, and loved the hire of the harlot at every thrashing floor, but forgot me."<sup>90</sup>

"Israel hath forgotten his creator, and built palaces, and Judah hath multiplied his fortified cities,"<sup>91</sup> says the prophet in regard to the fortresses built by Uzziah (p. 19). "They trusted to the number of thy warriors, but Israel's king passes away like a morning cloud. Ephraim is as a silly dove; they call on Egypt; they go to Assyria to bring whoredom. Ephraim goes after Asshur, and sends to the king for help. Ephraim will hunt after the wind, and strain after the East wind, that they may make a covenant with Assyria, and carry oil to Egypt.<sup>92</sup> The Deliverer king will not heal you. The East will come; a wind of Jehovah will rise out of the desert, which will plunder the treasure of costly furniture, and Samaria will repent. The calf of Bethaven (= house of Evil, – thus the prophet alters the name of Bethel = house of God, the chief place of worship in the kingdom of Israel) will be carried to Assyria, as a gift to the king, the Deliverer; Asshur shall be their king, for they will not amend. The days of punishment, of vengeance will come; as to the people, so shall it happen to the priests. Israel's pride shall be bowed down, and Judah shall fall with him. They shall not remain in the land of Jehovah; Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and eat unclean things in Assyria. They are gone because of destruction; Egypt shall gather them up, and Memphis shall bury them."<sup>93</sup> The high places

---

<sup>79</sup> Hosea v. 1.

<sup>80</sup> Hosea xiii. 5.

<sup>81</sup> Hosea xi. 1-4.

<sup>82</sup> Hosea x. 1.

<sup>83</sup> Hosea xiii. 2.

<sup>84</sup> Hosea iv. 13.

<sup>85</sup> Hosea ii. 5-8.

<sup>86</sup> Hosea x. 13.

<sup>87</sup> Hosea iv. 2.

<sup>88</sup> Hosea viii. 13.

<sup>89</sup> Hosea vi. 6.

<sup>90</sup> Hosea ii. 9-13; ix. 1.

<sup>91</sup> Hosea viii. 14.

<sup>92</sup> Hosea xii. 2.

<sup>93</sup> Hosea ix. 1-6; v. 13; vii. 11; viii. 9; x. 6; xi. 5; xiii. 15; xiv. 1.

of Bethaven shall be destroyed; thorns and thistles shall come up on their altars, and they shall say to the mountains, Cover us; and to the hills, Fall on us."<sup>94</sup>

"What shall I do to thee, Ephraim? how shall I deal with thee? Shall I destroy thee? saith Jehovah. But my heart is turned, my repentings are kindled; I will not execute the fierceness of my wrath; I am God and not man; as the Holy One I will not come into anger.<sup>95</sup> I will punish them till they repent, and in their affliction they will seek me early.<sup>96</sup> I will allure them into the wilderness; I will speak to their hearts, that Israel may sing again as in the days of his youth, and on the day when he came out of Egypt; and the name of Baal I will remove out of his mouth.<sup>97</sup> Return, O Israel, to Jehovah thy God. Speak ye to him; Take away iniquity, and receive us, that we offer the sacrifice of our lips. Assyria shall not save us; we will not ride on horses; the work of our hands shall be called our gods no more.<sup>98</sup> Then, saith Jehovah: I will hear Ephraim, and look with favour upon him. I will heal their backsliding, and come and love them freely; my anger is turned away, and I will let them dwell in their houses. I will be as dew upon Israel; Israel shall grow as a lily, and cast forth his roots as Lebanon: and I will betroth thee unto me for ever; I will betroth thee in righteousness and in judgment, in loving-kindness, gentleness, and mercies."<sup>99</sup>

The words of Hosea leave no doubt that Menahem, king of Israel, sought aid from Assyria in order to maintain himself on the throne. With this the Books of Kings agree. They tell us: Menahem gave to the king of Assyria 1000 kikkar of silver (according to the Babylonian standard about £300,000), "that the king might join him in establishing the kingdom in his hand." The payment of the money was imposed by Menahem on all the men of substance in Israel; fifty shekels of silver on every man. According to this the king of Israel was himself without means, but the land must have been in a position to pay such a considerable tribute, so large a sum. There must, according to this statement, have been at this time 60,000 families in Israel who were in a position to pay a mina each (about £5). The monuments of Assyria inform us that in the year 742 B.C. Tiglath Pileasar marched against northern Syria and Arpad (Tel Erfad p. 2); that he conquered Arpad after a siege of three years, or after three campaigns against the city.<sup>100</sup> In the city of Arpad – so we are told in a fragment of his annals – he received the tribute of Rezin of Damascus; 18 kikkar of gold, 3000 kikkar of silver, 200 kikkar of copper; and the tribute of Kustaspi of Kummukh, of Hiram of Tyre, of Pisiris of Karchemish.<sup>101</sup> This must, therefore, have taken place in the year 740 or 739 B.C. He received the tribute of Menahem immediately before the ninth year of his reign (737 B.C.), *i. e.* in the year 738 B.C. He tells us that at that time he received tribute from Kustaspi of Kummukh, Rezin of Damascus, Menahem of Samaria, Hiram of Tyre, Sibittibal of Gebal (Byblus), Urikki of Kui (Cilicia), Pisiris of Karchemish, Eniel of Hamath, Tarchular of Gamguma, Sulumal of Milid, Vassurmi of Tubal, and Zabibieh, the queen of the Arabs. Menahem, therefore, sought to purchase the help of Tiglath Pileasar by offering tribute soon after the fall of Arpad. Hence in these years the king of Assyria held a position which included northern and central Syria, and governed those countries immediately from the crossing of the Euphrates at Karchemish, and from Arpad. Passing beyond Hamath and Damascus, beyond Byblus and Tyre, he was now ruler over the kingdom of Samaria also. From the South-east a princess of the Arabs, from the North-west the prince of the Cilicians, sent tribute. Menahem of Israel must have died soon after the payment of tribute; the subjection to Assyria appears to have established his power so far that his son Pekahiah could succeed him on the throne (738 B.C.).

---

<sup>94</sup> Hosea x. 8.

<sup>95</sup> Hosea xi. 9.

<sup>96</sup> Hosea v. 15.

<sup>97</sup> Hosea ii. 14-17.

<sup>98</sup> Hosea xiv. 2-4.

<sup>99</sup> Hosea xiv. 5-9; ii. 19.

<sup>100</sup> Lists of rulers, 742-740, "during three years he conquered Arpad."

<sup>101</sup> Frag. 6, in G. Smith, p. 274.

But in the second year of his reign Pekahiah was murdered in the palace at Samaria by Pekah, the son of Remaliah, who now ascended the throne of Israel (736 B.C.). Pekah combined with Rezin, king of Damascus, for a united attack on the kingdom of Judah.

Judah did not remain untouched by the establishment and extensive advances of the Assyrian power in Syria. We saw in what successful struggles Uzziah-Azariah had extended the territory of Judah in his long reign; how agriculture and trade developed under him. The advance of Tiglath Pileser in the last years of the reign of Uzziah called these successes in question once more. It did not find Uzziah wholly unprepared. He had fortified Jerusalem more strongly; he had provided for the arming of his forces, and arranged the levy of the men of military age. A very mutilated fragment of the annals of Tiglath Pileser mentions twice the land of Judah, and three times the second half of the name of Azariah, *i. e.* the name by which Uzziah is named in the Books of Kings.<sup>102</sup> Another fragment, which deals with the events in Syria which took place before the payment of tribute to Menahem, again mentions Azariah (Uzziah); it informs us that Mount Lebanon, the land of Baalzephon,<sup>103</sup> the land of Ammana (the region of the Amanus?) the city of Hadrach had been subjugated; that the king "added to the land of Assyria nineteen districts of Hamath, situated on the sea of the setting sun, together with the cities in their land, which had revolted to Azariah in faithless rebellion, and had placed his officers and viceroys over them."<sup>104</sup> The districts of Hamath here mentioned must be sought between the Orontes and the sea, immediately north of Aradus. The occurrence no doubt took place in the time when Tiglath Pileser fought against or besieged Arpad, *i. e.* in the years from 742 B.C. to 740. From this we must conclude that Azariah (Uzziah) of Judah (neither he nor the kingdom of Judah is mentioned among the tributary states in these fragments) assumed a hostile position towards Tiglath Pileser; that during the struggle for Arpad he attempted to unite some of the states and tribes of Syria against the advance of Assyria. This opposition of Judah may have formed another motive for Menahem to place himself under the supremacy, and at the same time under the protection, of Tiglath Pileser. As vassals of Tiglath Pileser, Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of Israel may have felt themselves more justified in attacking the southern neighbour-state, the kingdom of Judah, which would not submit to the dominion of Assyria.

Uzziah was no more when Pekah obtained the throne of Israel. He had died four years previously (740 B.C.), and was buried in the sepulchres of the kings at Jerusalem. His son Jotham, who had already shared in the rule during the last years of his father's reign, sat on the throne of Judah. He withstood the attack of the combined Israelites and Damascenes.<sup>105</sup> But his son Ahaz, who succeeded him in the year 734 B.C., was reduced by this war to the greatest distress. The Philistines whom Uzziah had repelled and punished severely, the Edomites whom he had subjugated, rebelled. Pekah's warriors laid Judah waste, and carried rich booty and numerous prisoners to Samaria; Rezin pressed forward to the south to aid the Edomites, expelled the Judæans from Elath, and there established himself on the Red Sea. The hostile armies marched on Jerusalem. Ahaz "made his son to go through the fire" to avert the threatened ruin. At last he found no other means of rescue than to pay homage to Assyria, and entreat the protection of Tiglath Pileser.

In the last years of Uzziah, and in the reign of Jotham, Isaiah, the son of Amoz, had received the word at Jerusalem. Like Amos and Hosea, Isaiah contended against the luxury and dissoluteness of the rich, the injustice of the elders, the corruption of the judges, the idolatry in the land. He attacked the false security in which men reposed in the possession of horses and chariots of war; he announced the coming vengeance with even more vehement emphasis than his predecessors. If for them the gods of the other nations have already disappeared beside the One Jehovah, Isaiah represents the

---

<sup>102</sup> Eberhard Schrader, "Jahrb. protest. Theolog." 1876, s. 374.

<sup>103</sup> A different Baalzephon from that on the Red Sea; Exod. xiv. 2, 9.

<sup>104</sup> Schrader, *loc. cit.* s. 375; Rodwell, "Records of the Past," 5, 46; G. Smith, "Disc." p. 277.

<sup>105</sup> 2 Kings xv. 5, 7, 37.

approaching destruction as breaking out not only over Israel and Judah, but over all nations, because they go after false gods. Their evil deeds will also be punished; no power on the earth can stand before Jehovah. But behind this judgment, the horror of which will turn all men to Jehovah, Isaiah also exhibits the restoration of Israel and Judah, the restoration of the whole renewed world, in the most glowing colours. That was Jehovah's purpose "since the days of old."

"The land is full of horses," so Isaiah spake, "and there is no end of its chariots." As we have seen, Uzziah had amassed munitions of war, and arranged excellently the military power (p. 19), – "but the land is also full of idols, and they worship the work of their own hands. Every man oppresses his neighbour; the young man behaves proudly against the old, and the base against the honourable. Thy chiefs, O Jerusalem, are faithless men, the companions of thieves!<sup>106</sup> Every one loves bribery, and seeks after gain. They do no justice to the orphan, and regard not the cause of the widow. Woe to them that decree unrighteous decrees, and to the scribes who write iniquity, to turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor!<sup>107</sup> Woe to them who justify the wicked for reward, and take away the right of the just!<sup>108</sup> Woe to them that join house to house, and field to field, till they alone are possessors of the land!<sup>109</sup> What mean ye to beat my people in pieces, saith Jehovah, and grind the faces of the poor?<sup>110</sup> Woe to them that rise up early in the morning, and follow strong drink, who heated with wine sit till the night; and the harp, and the viol, the tabret, and pipe, and wine, are in their feasts!<sup>111</sup> Woe to them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink! Woe to them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter; that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight! Woe to them who draw upon them punishment with cords of vanity, and reward of sin with a cart-rope!"<sup>112</sup>

Isaiah carried the Jews from the service of sacrifice to the improvement of the heart, to righteous conversation and good works. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices to me?" so Isaiah represents Jehovah as saying. "I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of stalled calves; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, lambs, and he-goats. Who hath required of you to tread my courts? Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are trouble to me, I am weary to bear them. Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination to me: when ye spread forth your hands I will hide mine eyes from you; and when ye pray, I will not hear you.<sup>113</sup> With your mouth ye draw near to me, and with your lips ye honour me; but your heart ye keep far from me, and your fear of me is taught by the precept of men.<sup>114</sup> Relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead the cause of the widow. Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil."<sup>115</sup>

"What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done to it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes? Ye have turned my vineyard into a pasture; the spoil of the poor is in your houses. Now I will take away the hedge, and pull down the walls, that it may be trodden down.<sup>116</sup> I will come to judgment with your elders and chiefs, and I will deal marvellously with this people; the wisdom of their wise men, and the understanding of the

---

<sup>106</sup> Isa. ii. 7. The moral precepts of Isaiah are collected in the text without regard to the chronology.

<sup>107</sup> Isa. x. 1, 2.

<sup>108</sup> Isa. v. 23.

<sup>109</sup> Isa. v. 8.

<sup>110</sup> Isa. iii. 14, 15.

<sup>111</sup> Isa. v. 11, 12.

<sup>112</sup> Isa. v. 18-22.

<sup>113</sup> Isa. i. 10-15.

<sup>114</sup> Isa. xxix. 13.

<sup>115</sup> Isa. i. 16, 17.

<sup>116</sup> Isa. v. 4, 5, 3, 14.

prudent shall be hid."<sup>117</sup> After Isaiah had depicted the terrors of the day of judgment, the quaking of the earth, the creeping away and the death of sinners, in lively colours, he represents the people as crying out: "Who of us shall dwell with the devouring fire, and the everlasting flame?" and then answers: "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; who despiseth the gain of oppressions; that turneth his hands from holding of bribes, and stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; who taketh justice for his measuring line and righteousness for his balance: he shall dwell on high; his place of defence shall be the munitions of the rock, and his waters shall not be dried up. Though your sins be red like scarlet, they shall be white as snow, if ye obey Jehovah."<sup>118</sup>

With the death of Jotham the distress increased. Isaiah warns his people not to seek aid from Assyria. "Wickedness," he cries, "burneth as fire; no man shall spare his fellow. He shall snatch on the right hand and be hungry; and eat on the left hand and be unsatisfied. Manasseh shall eat Ephraim, and Ephraim Manasseh, and both together shall fall upon Judah."<sup>119</sup> "Fear not," he says to king Ahaz, "neither be faint-hearted, for the two tails of these smoking firebrands; for the fierce anger of Rezin and the son of Remaliah; they shall not break open Jerusalem, and the land, before whose kings thou art afraid, shall soon be made desolate."<sup>120</sup> But with the razor that is hired beyond the river (Euphrates) the Lord will shear off thy head, and the hair of thy feet, and thy beard."<sup>121</sup> And when Ahaz refused to be restrained, Isaiah proclaimed: "Because Israel rejoices in Rezin and the son of Remaliah, the Lord will bring upon them the waters of the river strong and many. The stream shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks; the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria. But the stream shall pass through Judah; it shall overflow and go over till it reaches even to the neck."<sup>122</sup>

"Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath Pileasar, king of Assyria," so the Books of Kings tell us, "saying, I am thy servant and thy son; come up and save me out of the hands of the king of Aram (of Damascus) and the king of Israel. And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of Jehovah, and in the treasures of the king's house, and sent a present to the king of Assyria. Then the king of Assyria gave ear to him. He marched out against Damascus and took it, and carried away the inhabitants to Kir, and slew Rezin. And in Israel Tiglath Pileasar took Ijon and Abel-beth-Maachah, and Janoha, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, the whole land of Naphtali, and led them away to Assyria. And Hoseas, the son of Elah, set on foot a conspiracy against Pekah, and defeated him, and slew him, and was king in his place. But Ahaz went to Damascus to meet king Tiglath Pileasar."<sup>123</sup>

The Assyrian list of rulers mentions for the year 734 B.C. a campaign of Tiglath Pileasar against the land of the Philistines, and for the years 733 and 732 B.C. campaigns of the king against Damascus. A fragment of the annals informs us that the army of Damascus was defeated; that their king Rezin (Rasunnu) fled to the great gate of his city; that his captive generals were crucified; that the city was besieged; that Hadara, the house of the father of Rezin, was taken; that 591 places in 16 districts of the kingdom of Damascus (Imirisu) were laid waste.<sup>124</sup> A further fragment informs us that Tiglath Pileasar made himself master of the cities of Hadrach, Zemar, and Arka (the two ancient cities of the Phenicians on the coast, already known to us); that he reached the borders of the land of Omri (Israel); that Hanno, king of Gaza, fled to Egypt before the face of the warrior Tiglath Pileasar. Afterwards the fragment mentions the land of Omri, speaks of a sending or carrying away to

---

<sup>117</sup> Isa. xxix. 14.

<sup>118</sup> Isa. xxxiii. 14-16; i. 18, 19.

<sup>119</sup> Isa. ix. 17-20.

<sup>120</sup> Isa. vii. 4, 6, 16.

<sup>121</sup> Isa. vii. 20.

<sup>122</sup> Isa. viii. 4-8.

<sup>123</sup> 2 Kings xv. 29, 30; xvi. 5-10.

<sup>124</sup> Frag. 10, in G. Smith, "Disc." p. 282; E. Schrader, "K. A. T." s. 151.

Assyria, and continues: "Pekah (Pakaha) their king they had slain. Hoseas (Husi) I made king over them."<sup>125</sup> The inscription, which comprises the deeds of Tiglath Pileasar down to the last year of his reign, mentions towards the end the princes of Assyria, who brought him tribute: Sibittibal of Byblus, Eniel of Hamath, Mattanbal of Arvad, Sanib of Ammon (Bit Ammanai), Salman of Moab, Mitinti of Ascalon, Ahaz of Judah (Jauhazi, Jahudai), Kosmalak of Edom, Hanno (Hanun) of Gaza.<sup>126</sup>

The attempt of Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of Israel to break the rise of the Philistines and Edomites, and the power of the kingdom of Judah, fortified as it was and strengthened by Uzziah, led to important consequences, to the subjugation of Syria to Assyria throughout its whole extent. When Ahaz called for help, Tiglath Pileasar turned against the enemies of Judah. The kingdom of Damascus, which for 120 years had so powerfully withstood the Assyrians, succumbed after a struggle of two years. Tyre and Byblus had long paid tribute to Tiglath Pileasar, and now Aradus was compelled to recognise the supremacy of Assyria; Israel was overrun: the inhabitants of the northern towns – Ijon, Abel-beth-maacha, Hazor and Kedesh, and the dwellers in the land of Naphtali on the lakes of Merom and Genezareth, and of the land of Gilead – were carried away to Assyria. The eastern neighbours of Israel and of the land of Gilead, the Ammonites and Moabites, were driven to submit like the Edomites; the cities of the Philistines were conquered. With the subjugation of Ascalon and Gaza the Assyrian kingdom became the neighbour of Egypt.

---

<sup>125</sup> Frag. 12, in G. Smith, p. 224, 225; Rodwell, "Records of the Past," 5, 52; E. Schrader, "K. A. T." s. 145.

<sup>126</sup> Ll. 57-62, in G. Smith, "Disc." p. 262, 263; E. Schrader, *loc. cit.* s. 147.

## CHAPTER III. THE PHARAOHS OF TANIS, BUBASTIS, AND NAPATA

At the close of the fourteenth century B.C. Ramses III. had secured Egypt against the attacks of the Libyans, Syrians, and Arabians. His successors of the same name remained peacefully within the borders of their land. Neither tradition nor monuments tell us of their campaigns. Two or three sepulchres in the rocks of Biban el Moluk and some inscriptions give us their names, and inform us that these Ramessids built at the temple of Chon at Thebes, that they maintained the dominion of Thebes up the Nile as far as Mt. Barkal down to the year 1100 B.C.<sup>127</sup> Of more importance is the fact that under the successors of Ramses VI., the last rulers of the name of Ramses, who sat on the throne from the year 1200 to 1074 B.C., the high-priests of Thebes obtained a position which formed a strong counterpoise to the power of the kings, and at length threw it into the back-ground, if it did not altogether remove it. In inscriptions in the temple of Chon, Herhor, the high-priest at the time of Ramses XIII., receives the title of prince (*si suten*, king's son) of Cush, a title borne by the viceroys of Napata since Ramses II. They call him "Commander-in-chief of the army in Upper and Lower Egypt;" and finally, "Si-Amun" and "Si-Ra," and with these titles, which were borne by the Pharaohs, Herhor receives also the symbols of the king. It is also thought that the inscriptions speak of tribute of the Retennu, *i. e.* the Syrians, which he received.<sup>128</sup> It may be that Herhor rose to the throne after the death of Ramses XIII., or that he reigned during his lifetime, or that he absolutely deposed him. Pianchi, the son of Herhor, is called in the monuments "High-priest of Ammon, Prophet of Mut, Commander of the cavalry of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt;" but the king, whose officer Pianchi was, is not mentioned. On the other hand, Pinotem, the son of this Pianchi, like Herhor, bears on the monuments the addition of a divine name "Miamun," after the manner of the Pharaohs, and royal symbols. A memorial stone of Thebes tells us that Mencheper-Ra, general-in-chief of the army of Upper and Lower Egypt, son of king Miamun Pinotem, marched out in the twenty-fifth year, *i. e.* in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of Pinotem, to Patores, *i. e.* Upper Egypt, in order to "restore peace in the land and punish the enemy." The families of Thebes received him with songs of joy; on the fourth intercalary day, on the feast of the birth of Isis, the majesty of Ammon, the king of the gods, was brought forth in procession; Mencheper-Ra implored the sanction of Ammon, that the banished – there were myriads of them – might be brought back, and the god gave his sanction. It seems then that the supremacy of the family of Herhor met with a violent resistance, and that Pinotem nevertheless found himself strong enough in the twenty-fifth year of his reign to publish an act of amnesty. Whether Pinotem's son, Mencheper-Ra, came to the throne, whether and how the race of the Ramessids became extinct, we do not know.<sup>129</sup> But the period of the extinction of the Ramessids and of the priests of Thebes who contended with them for power, or shared it with them, we may place about the year 1074 B.C.

In Manetho's list the Ramessids are succeeded by a dynasty of seven princes, who belonged to the canton of Tanis (Zoan). Together they are said to have reigned over Egypt 114 years. The first prince of this house, Smendes, must have ascended the throne about 20 years before the time when the people of Israel raised up Saul to be king. The chronology of the Hebrews allows us to establish the fact that the last prince of this house must have come to an end at least ten years before the middle

---

<sup>127</sup> Vol. i. 179.

<sup>128</sup> Lepsius, "Abh. Berl. Akad." 1856, s. 258; Brugsch, "Hist. of Egypt," II. p. 193.

<sup>129</sup> It ends in Brugsch, *loc. cit.* II. 198, with Ramses XVI.

of the tenth century.<sup>130</sup> From this point (960 B.C.), the period already mentioned as the length of the dynasty of the Tanites, carries us back to the year 1074 for the date of the accession of Smendes.

Since the expulsion of the Hyksos the central point of the kingdom had remained for more than 500 years at Thebes. With the accession of the Tanites it was removed to the Delta. Henceforth it was never restored to Upper Egypt or to Thebes. After a reign of 26 years Smendes was succeeded by Psusennes, who sat on the throne for 46 years (1048-1002 B.C.). If it was Psusennes, who took into his protection the young son of the king of Edom, who was saved from David and Joab by the servants of his father, and gave him the sister of his wife in marriage,<sup>131</sup> it is the daughter of Amenophis, the fourth prince of this house (998-989 B.C.), which Solomon took to wife, whom he honoured above his other wives, and for whom he built a special house near his new palace (II. 185). Solomon remained on good terms with the successors of Amenophis. Only a few shields have been preserved from the monuments of this dynasty in the ruins of Tanis; in these we can recognise the name of Smendes in the form of Si-Mentu, of Psusennes I. in the form Psiuncha, of Amenophis in the form Amenemenkam, and lastly of Psusennes II. in the form Hor Psiuncha.<sup>132</sup>

The last prince of this house, Psusennes II., was succeeded in the year 960 B.C. by Seshonk, the Ssheshonk of the monuments, the Shishak of the Hebrews. With him begins a new dynasty, which, according to Manetho's list, belonged to the canton of Bubastis. In the Western Delta a considerable part of the population, at any rate since the time of the shepherd kings, was of a Semitic character. But families belonging to the nation of the shepherds were not all that remained from those periods; Semitic elements remained in the language and manners of the Egyptians, and these certainly increased in importance owing to the campaigns of the Tuthmosis and Amenophis in Syria, the long settlement of the Hebrews in this district, the relations of Ramses II. to the Hittites; lastly, to the trade of the Phenicians, the friendly relation and lively intercourse which the Tanites maintained since Solomon's time with the kingdom of Israel. The names of the forefathers and descendants of Ssheshonk show that he belonged to a Semitic family living in the canton of Bubastis. His forefathers had risen under the Pharaohs of Tanis; his grandfather, whose name the grandson bore, had married a lady of distinction. The offspring of this marriage, Nemrut (Nimrod), was captain of the body-guard (Mashawasha), and bore the Semitic title, *Ser a mat, i. e.* sovereign; at any rate he is so named by his son Ssheshonk on a granite block at Abydos, which enumerates the funds supplied by the son for the libations poured to his father who is buried here – unless we have rather to recognise in this title as well as in the addition to it, "prince of princes," titles of distinction subsequently transferred from the son to the father.<sup>133</sup> In another inscription the same Ssheshonk calls his predecessor Psusennes II. king of Upper Egypt;<sup>134</sup> a memorial stone of Selsilis mentions a double accession of Ssheshonk; the inscription on a statue of the Nile in the British Museum states that king Hor Psiuncha married his daughter Rakamat to Osorkon, the son of Ssheshonk.<sup>135</sup> Hence we may assume that Ssheshonk, the son of Nemrut, became a rival for the throne; that Psusennes II. was perhaps compelled to retire to Upper Egypt, whither Ssheshonk could not penetrate; that a compromise took place with Psusennes, the possessor of the throne, by means of this marriage, which secured the succession to Ssheshonk and his family; and that Ssheshonk subsequently described his rebellion as his first accession, and his accession after the death of Psusennes II. as his second.<sup>136</sup>

<sup>130</sup> II. 229, note.

<sup>131</sup> II. 155.

<sup>132</sup> Maspero reads Psiuncha; Brugsch, Pisebkhan.

<sup>133</sup> In the unpublished inscription of Abydos in Brugsch, "Hist. of Egypt," II. p. 199.

<sup>134</sup> Brugsch, *loc. cit.* II. p. 204.

<sup>135</sup> According to Brugsch, Rakamat, or Karamat, was not the wife of Osorkon, but of Ssheshonk, *loc. cit.*, p. 204.

<sup>136</sup> To make Pithut, Ssheshonk, Nemrut, and Ssheshonk II., as well as Panrechnes or Pallash-Nisu, kings of Assyria, and place a conquest of Egypt by Assyria at the end of the twenty-first dynasty (Brugsch, "Hist. of Egypt," II. p. 198), because Nemrut or Nemaroth is called on the stone of Abydos "*Ser a mat*," and "prince of princes," appears to me absolutely impossible. How could one

However this may be, whether Ssheshonk in the first instance obtained the power over Lower Egypt only, whether he afterwards lost it, or whether he did not obtain the supremacy till after the death of Hor Psiuncha,<sup>137</sup> he took up a different position towards the kingdom of Judah from that occupied by the dynasty of Tanis since the accession of Amenophthis. When flying from Solomon, Jeroboam found refuge and protection with Ssheshonk. When after Solomon's death the ten tribes made Jeroboam their king, as against Rehoboam, Ssheshonk in the year B.C. 949 undertook the campaign against Judah which secured Jeroboam; he confirmed the division, carried away spoil from Judah, and exhibited Israel in dependence on Egypt. The results of this campaign Ssheshonk caused to be set forth in the most splendid manner on the walls of the temple of Karnak, westward of the building which Ramses III. had here erected in the circuit-wall, (I. 177). The picture displays the victorious Pharaoh, and the taxed places as bound figures in a long row (II. 233). Over the row of vanquished places we read that "the good god (the king) returned in peace, after defeating the nations of the North and South; that he led home captive nations who had never seen Egypt, that he spread the terror of his name as far as the four pillars of the heavens." Ammon says to the king: "My heart is glad, that I have seen thy victories. I have granted that the nations of the South shall be defeated and come to thee, and the nations of the North shall be subject to the greatness of thy name. Their kings throw themselves on the belly, for they are stricken to the ground in their vallies. I have known the splendour of thy thoughts; thou hast carried out the work of my temple at Thebes, the brilliant place, which my heart loves; thou hast begun to build in Hermonthis and Heliopolis."<sup>138</sup> We see what achievements the inscriptions of the Pharaohs can make out of a plundering excursion into the south of Syria: the nations of the North and of the South are overcome; the terror of Ssheshonk is spread to the pillars of the sky.

Besides this picture of his victories on the outer wall, Ssheshonk erected a kind of entrance porch to the southern court of the great temple at Karnak. The inscriptions on the architrave of this porch tell us that Ssheshonk had given command to enlarge the temple of Ammon; that he had made the city of Thebes to live again.<sup>139</sup> On a memorial stone in the quarries of Selsilis, the goddess Mut places the king, "the great conqueror of all nations," accompanied by his son Aupoth,<sup>140</sup> before Ammon of Thebes, Ra-Harmachu of Heliopolis, and Ptah of Memphis. The inscription says: "That is the divine benefactor; Ra wears his shape; he is the image of Harmachu. Ammon has placed him on the throne, in order to complete what he had begun, in the occupation of Egypt for the second time. This is king Ssheshonk; he caused a new quarry to be opened for the beginning of a structure. Of such a nature is the kindness which he has shown to his father, Ammon Ra." Then Ssheshonk himself says: "It is a beautiful thing to work for Ammon. Grant me a long reign for that which I have done. I have caused a new quarry to be opened for him for the beginning of a work. The high priest of Ammon has carried it out, Aupoth the highest captain of the most famous army, the first of all the warriors of Patores, the son of Ssheshonk."<sup>141</sup> The architect also, who had to erect the portico,

---

of the kings of Asshur, who, in the service of Asshur, Samas, and Bin, overthrew the nations, allow himself to be buried near Osiris of Abydus? – how could his son perform Egyptian funeral rites for him there? The Books of the Hebrews must have preserved some knowledge of a conquest of Egypt in the time of David and Solomon, in the first half of the tenth century – how could the armies of Assyria have come to Egypt except through Syria? Tiglath Pileser I., about 1100 B.C., touched northern Syria merely in passing; not till the ninth century did Assurnasirpal again come as far as Mount Amanus and the coast of the Phenicians, and Shalmanesar as far as Damascus. A hundred years later Tiglath Pileser II. first planted a firm foot in Syria. The Semitic (?) character of the names of the princes of the twenty-second dynasty, who are also distinguished as eager worshippers of the gods of Egypt, as well as the Semitic nationality of the six or eight servants, who, according to the stone of Abydus, were allotted to the plots of ground for the funeral service of Nemaroth at Abydus, are sufficiently explained by what we know of the mingling of the population in the Western Delta, and of other Semitic influence in Egypt.

<sup>137</sup> It ought perhaps to be observed that Shishak (1 Kings xi. 40), is not called Pharaoh, but Melek Mizraim.

<sup>138</sup> Brugsch, "Hist. d'Egypte," p. 227.

<sup>139</sup> Brugsch, "Hist. d'Egypte," p. 222.

<sup>140</sup> Others read Shuput.

<sup>141</sup> Brugsch, "Hist. of Egypt," II. 212.

Horemsaf, mentions this task in an inscription at Selsilis. In the twenty-first year, *i. e.* in the twenty-first year of the reign,<sup>142</sup> Ssheshonk had commanded him to obtain the best stones of Selsilis, in order to erect buildings for the king of the gods, and to surround them with a strong wall.<sup>143</sup>

Ssheshonk was succeeded by his son Osorkon, the husband of the daughter of Psusennes II., the last king of the preceding dynasty. It is supposed that in him we may discover the Cushite Serach, who, according to the Books of Chronicles, invaded the kingdom of Judah in the fifteenth year of king Asa, *i. e.* in 918 B.C., but was defeated by him at Maresa (II. 233). The monuments of Egypt only mention to us the names of the two wives of Osorkon. Osorkon was followed by Takeloth, Osorkon II., Ssheshonk II., Takeloth II., Ssheshonk III., Pimai, and Ssheshonk IV. No monuments of these kings have come down to us except memorial stones in the tombs of the Apis on the plateau of Memphis. These memorials show that the regulations of Ssheshonk I. to give to one of his sons the office of high priest at Thebes, and with this office to combine the command of divisions of the army, and to put other divisions of the army in the hands of other members of the royal house – regulations obviously intended to strengthen the power of the throne – were observed by his successors. We find the sons of his successors as high priests of Thebes and Memphis, as commanders of the troops of Thebes, Hermopolis, and Heracleopolis, as "princes (*i. e.* leaders) of the Mashawasha."<sup>144</sup> We remember the struggles which the earliest successors of Ramses II. had to carry on against the Libyans, especially against the Mashawasha, or Maxyians. From the time of Ramses III. the body-guard of the Pharaohs seems to have consisted mainly of Libyans, especially of Mashawasha; the warrior caste of Egypt appears to have been chiefly kept up and supplemented by Libyans. The father of Ssheshonk was, as observed, the captain of the Mashawasha. Ssheshonk, the son of Osorkon II. (afterwards Ssheshonk II.), as high priest of Memphis buried in the twenty-third year of the reign of his father an Apis, who had died in that year. Takeloth, the son of this Ssheshonk II. (afterwards Takeloth II.), was high priest of Ammon of Thebes. In the fifteenth year of the reign of his father a rebellion broke out in the cantons of the South and North. He fought without ceasing for many years at the side of his father, and gained victories over the rebels.<sup>145</sup> According to the Apis-stones, Ssheshonk III. reigned more than 50 years. In the twenty-eighth year of his reign an Apis was born, which lived 26 years, and was buried in the second year of king Pimai under the superintendence of Petise, the son of the high priest of Memphis, Takeloth, and the royal princess Thisbastir. The successor of this Apis, which was discovered in the same year of king Pimai, died in the fourth year of Ssheshonk IV., a third in the eleventh, and a fourth in the thirty-seventh year of the same reign.<sup>146</sup>

According to Manetho's list, the nine princes of this dynasty of Bubastis reigned altogether 120 years; but the sum of the reigns, according to the items in the list, only reaches 116 years. The years of the reigns given on special occasions, on the monuments mentioned, give at least 150 years for six alone of these nine princes. If we maintain the assertion of Manetho, the dynasty of the Bubastites reigned from the year 960 B.C. to the year 840 B.C.; if we calculate the length of the rule of this dynasty according to the generations of the princes, then, even if the length of each generation is taken only at 20 years, they must at least have reigned 180 years, *i. e.* from 960 to 780 B.C.<sup>147</sup> That the rule of the Bubastites ended about the year 780 B.C., at any rate in the minds of the chronographers who have preserved Manetho's list in the excerpt, follows from the fact that our excerpts put the celebration of the first Olympian festival in the reign of Petubastis, the prince who immediately succeeds the

<sup>142</sup> According to Manetho's list, Sesonchis reigned 21 years.

<sup>143</sup> Brugsch, *loc. cit.* II. p. 198.

<sup>144</sup> *Sera en mashush.*

<sup>145</sup> Chabas, "Mélanges," Ser. 2, pp. 73-107.

<sup>146</sup> Lepsius, "Abh. Berl. Akad. Phil. Hist. Klasse," 1856, s. 264. Mariette, "Bull. Archéolog. Athen. Franc." 1855, pp. 93, 98-100.

<sup>147</sup> Cp. Von Gutschmid, "Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Orients," s. 104, *seqq.*

Bubastites. We may therefore assume that the Bubastites reigned over Egypt from the year 960 to about the year 780 B.C.

The successors of Petubastis of Tanis, whose date thus falls about the year 775 B.C., are, according to Manetho, Osorkon (the third of this name), Psammus, and Zet. Diodorus tells us of a Tnephachtus, king of Egypt, who carried on war with the Arabs. One day, when in the desert, there was a lack of the means of subsistence, and Tnephachtus after a day of fasting enjoyed so highly a scanty meal, that he abominated luxury, and cursed the king who first introduced it. So earnest was he with this curse that he had it engraved in sacred characters in the temple of Zeus at Thebes.<sup>148</sup> Plutarch also tells us: On a campaign against the Arabs the baggage was left behind, and Technactis (Tnephachtus) gladly satisfied himself with the food which was at hand, and when he subsequently fell into a deep sleep on the straw, he was so pleased with this simple mode of life that he cursed Menes who first seduced the Egyptians from a simple and parsimonious mode of life, and caused this curse to be engraved on a memorial stone, with the sanction of the priests.<sup>149</sup> The son of this Tnephachtus is called Bocchoris by Diodorus and Plutarch; Manetho's list puts a king Bocchoris after Zet, and describes him as belonging to the district of Sais. The date of Bocchoris is fixed by the fact that the seventh celebration of the Olympian games, *i. e.* the year 752, occurred during his reign.<sup>150</sup> If Petubastis reigned, as we saw, about the year 775 B.C., and Bocchoris ascended the throne about 753 B.C., the date of his father Tnephachtus, who is not mentioned in Manetho's list (he must be meant by the Zet of the list), will fall in the period between 770 and 753 B.C. We can only assume that Tnephachtus, in the time of Petubastis or Osorkon III. who succeeded Petubastis, rebelled against the reigning Pharaoh, and obtained the power, and that the list of Manetho has passed him over as the opponent of the legitimate princes. As a fact we shall find that other usurpers beside Tnephachtus rose up beside and against Petubastis and Osorkon; that Osorkon was restricted to Bubastis, and as the inscriptions of Thebes mention Psammus (Psimut) we may further suppose that he retired from Tanis, where Manetho's list places him, to Upper Egypt.

The extinction of the military vigour of Egypt under the later Ramessids, the formation of the body-guard and army of Libyan mercenaries, bore its natural fruit. The disruption of the state-power, which thus begun as early as the later Bubastites, led under Petubastis and Osorkon III. to the complete ruin of the kingdom. The commanders of the army in the districts, and no doubt other men of great position and ambition, threw off obedience, made themselves independent, and supported by their soldiers gained an independent power. Nine hundred years after the expulsion of the shepherds the ancient kingdom broke up into a series of separate dominions. A memorial stone discovered in the remains of Napata, near Mount Barkal, displays to us quite a different picture of the condition of Egypt about the middle of the eighth century from that which we should imagine when we read in Manetho an apparently unbroken succession of Pharaohs. On that stone Osorkon is indeed mentioned, but only as king of the city of Bubastis. Beside him we find Petisi of Athribis (west of Bubastis), Anchor of Sesennu (Hermopolis minor), Nimrod (Nemrut) of Sesennu (Hermopolis major, now Ashmunein), Ssheshonk of Busiris, Pefabast of Chnensu (Heraclea major), Pithenef of Pisabtu; fourteen or fifteen princes, and among them Tafnecht (Tnephachtus) of Sais. It is clear from this that Petubastis and Osorkon were not able to maintain the royal authority; that Osorkon was limited to Bubastis; the chiefs of the rest of the land stood beside him with equal right and equal power. The same memorial teaches us that Tnephachtus of Sais gained Memphis; that he undertook to subjugate the remaining princes to his supremacy. He succeeded in forcing king Osorkon and the chiefs of Upper Egypt into obedience; they recognised in him their superior; and he attempted to make even the princes of Upper Egypt, *i. e.* the Begs of the Mamelukes in that region, his vassals.

---

<sup>148</sup> Diod. 1, 45.

<sup>149</sup> Plut. "de Isid." c. 8; cf. Athenæus, p. 418.

<sup>150</sup> Joseph. "c. Apionem," 2, 2, 6.

The Amenemha and Sesurtesen had once carried the southern border of Egypt to Semne and Kumne. After them the Tuthmosis and Amenophis forced their way as far as Mount Barkal; Lower as well as Upper Nubia became a province of Egypt. The Ramessids had maintained this province, and governed it by viceroys. Amenophis III. and Ramses II. filled Nubia as far as Mount Barkal with their temples; thus the worship observed in Egypt became dominant in Nubia also, especially the worship of the god Ammon, whom Upper Egypt and the Pharaohs of Thebes regarded as the highest deity. With the religious worship, and the government of Egyptian magistrates, the language, alphabet, and manners of Egypt became current in Nubia, although the people retained their ancient tongue. After a continuance of 500 years, when the Egyptian power began to sink under the later Ramessids, and the high priests of Ammon at Thebes rose against them, – before the year 1100 B.C. the supremacy of Egypt over the South became extinguished. The high priest Herhor is the last who bears the title of "King's son of Cush;" under the Tanites, Smendes and his successors, the monuments no longer mention any viceroy of Cush.<sup>151</sup> We may, therefore, assume that Nubia was an independent state from the year 1100 B.C. onwards. Yet the long continuance of the Egyptian rule had caused the style and civilisation of Egypt to strike firm roots here. The city, which was adorned by Amenophis III. and Ramses II. with splendid buildings; the Neb (Napata) of the hieroglyphics, the Merua or Berua of the native language, was the seat of the princes of the new state, in which, before as after, the style, worship, and writing of Egypt was predominant; the language also, which the new monarchy used in its documents, was the language of Egypt. The name of the first independent ruler of Napata, the king of Ethiopia, as the Greeks call him, whom we know, is mentioned in the memorial stone already spoken of. The name and attribute are Egyptian: Pianchi Miamun.<sup>152</sup> In the twenty-first year of his reign, in the month Thot, so the memorial tells us, it was announced to king Pianchi that Tnephachtus of Sais and Memphis had possessed himself of the whole of the land of the West. "The princes and lords of the cities are like dogs before his feet. All princes who recognise his power, these he allows to remain, each in his own canton, as lords and princes of the cities." The princes in Upper Egypt who were not yet subject to Tafnecht, sent to Pianchi "messages continually, whether he also would wish to know nothing of the land of the South," *i. e.* whether he also was inclined to abandon Upper Egypt to Tafnecht.

The condition of Egypt was thus inviting enough to induce a power, strongly established in the South, to extend its dominion to the North, at least over Upper Egypt. Upper Egypt was naturally from an ancient period in closer relation to Nubia and Napata than Lower Egypt. The removal of the residence and centre of the kingdom to Lower Egypt at the time of the Tanites and Bubastites must have contributed to awaken anew the old opposition between the upper and lower land: and in its turn, when Tafnecht had got the upper hand in Lower Egypt, and forced his way to Upper Egypt, this opposition strengthened the wish to seek support and protection on the upper Nile, before submitting to a Saite, a prince of Lower Egypt.

King Pianchi sent his army to aid the princes of Upper Egypt. According to the memorial stone Tafnecht, who with his vassals awaited the Ethiopians at Chnensu (Heracleopolis major), was defeated. The Ethiopians then turned upon Ashmunein, which was defended against them by its prince, Nemrut. Here, however, as the stone admits, they suffered a severe defeat. At the beginning of the next year, Pianchi himself set forth, celebrated the festival of Ammon at Thebes, commenced the regular siege of Ashmunein by throwing up a wall of circumvallation, and then for three days bombarded the city. Then Nemrut besought Pianchi to receive him among his servants and accept his tribute. Pianchi marched into the city, sacrificed to the god and lord of the city, "to his father Thot," bulls, calves, and birds; and the people of Ashmunein sang: "Beautiful is the Horus, who dwells in

---

<sup>151</sup> Mariette, "Revue Archéolog." 1865, 12, 178.

<sup>152</sup> Pianchi is also called the son of the high priest Herhor (p. 51). But this coincidence does not compel us to explain the kings of Napata as descendants of that Herhor who lived 400 years before Pianchi of Napata.

his city, the son of Ra, Pianchi; and Pianchi repaired to the house of king Nemrut, to his treasury and the house of his possessions." When Nemrut had surrendered to Pianchi, Pefabast of Chnensu also appeared with gifts, with gold, silver, precious stones, and horses, threw himself on the ground before Pianchi, and said: "Hail to thee, Horus, mighty Bull! I am sunken in darkness; give clearness to my countenance; I will be a servant together with my subjects, who will bring presents." When four other cities had opened their gates, Pianchi appeared with his ships before Memphis, and promised to spare the inhabitants of the city: "the children should not weep" if they opened the gates to him; he would merely sacrifice to Ptah and the gods of Memphis. Tafnecht threw 8000 of his warriors into the city. Yet Pianchi succeeded in taking the city from the harbour in open battle; "many were slain, many captured alive;" Pianchi caused the temples to be protected; purified himself, and offered a great sacrifice "to his father Ptah." Then Aupoth and all the princes of Lower Egypt submitted, and Pianchi marched to On (Heliopolis); and on the height near On, in the sight of Ra at his rising, he offered a great sacrifice, and went into the temple to behold the god in the Benben chamber. "He was alone; he undid the bars, and opened the doors, and beheld his father Ra, and the morning barque of Ra, and the evening barque of Tum. Then he closed the doors and sealed them." After this, Osorkon (of Bubastis) and Petise (of Athribis) submitted. Tafnecht himself sent a messenger to Pianchi; he could not stand before his fire; Pianchi may receive his possessions for his treasury. Pianchi on his part sent the "leader of the prayers" and his chief captain, and Tafnecht took the oath: "he would not transgress Pianchi's commands, nor disregard his words; he would do no harm to any prince against his will; he would do according to the words of Pianchi." Then the ships were laden with silver, gold, copper, and other good things of Lower Egypt, and Pianchi went up the stream, and the dwellers on the bank sang: "O royal conqueror, thou hast come, and hast smitten Lower Egypt; thou makest the men to be women. Thy work will continue, thou king and friend of Thebes."<sup>153</sup>

This campaign of Pianchi from Napata, the first attempt of a ruler of Ethiopia to possess himself of Egypt, must be placed about the year 760 B.C.<sup>154</sup> We can hardly contest the successes which the memorial stone ascribes to Pianchi. Pianchi as a fact took Chnensu and Memphis; he reached Heliopolis; most of the vassals of Tnephachtus paid homage to him. But Pianchi's own narrative does not maintain that he took Sais, and that Tnephachtus appeared before him. He makes a treaty with Tnephachtus; he is contented that Tnephachtus recognises his supremacy, and at once turns back to Ethiopia with the presents or tribute of the vassals of Tnephachtus. From this it follows that Tnephachtus maintained the Lower Delta; that Pianchi either made no vigorous attempt to conquer this district, or was unable to conquer it; that he did not believe that he could maintain his position permanently in Egypt, and therefore was content with a recognition of his supremacy. In any case, after Pianchi's retirement, Tnephachtus re-established his power over the princes of these districts; he must even have extended it further to the south, than was the case before Pianchi's campaign, if, as Diodorus states, he set up inscriptions in the temple of Zeus, *i. e.* of Ammon, at Thebes, and could bequeath the sovereignty over Egypt to his son. The position which Manetho's list and the accounts of Western nations give to his son Bocchoris, is in favour of the assertion, that Tnephachtus succeeded in subjugating all Egypt to his power. It is easily conceivable that to such a vigorous and indomitable warrior the ceremonial and the splendour of the Pharaohs' table and kitchen, the royal bed-chambers and couches, were highly distasteful.

---

<sup>153</sup> De Rougé, "Mémoire sur une inscript. de Pianchi;" Brugsch, "Hist. of Egypt," I. 129; II. 243, 247.

<sup>154</sup> I have shown above that Petubastis came to the throne about the year 775 B.C., and Bocchoris, the son of Tnephachtus, about 753 B.C.; Tnephachtus, therefore, must be placed in the time between 770-753 B.C. Thus the time of the campaign of Pianchi is fixed. To throw back the campaign nearly 100 years is not possible, owing to the mention of Osorkon, the names of Nemrut, Ssheshonk, Petise, which belong to the house of the Bubastites, and the date of Tnephachtus. If the lists of Assurbanipal mention a Ssheshonk of Busiris, a Tafnecht – not of Sais, but of Buni or Bunubu; a Pefabast, not of Chnensu but of Zoan – the reappearance of these names can be explained by the fact that these dynastic families have also been preserved among the Ethiopians (p. 72).

Of Bocchoris, the son of Tnephachtus, "the wise, the celebrated in song," who succeeded his father in the year 753 B.C., Athenæus tells us that he lived as simply as his father.<sup>155</sup> Diodorus narrates that he was of a very weak body, but surpassed all his forefathers in acuteness of mind: his decisions were so excellent that many were quoted even in his day. The Egyptians reckoned the wise Bocchoris as their fourth law-giver; he founded the laws of the monarchy, and from him proceeded the rules about debt and contract.<sup>156</sup> Any one who borrowed money without a written contract was to be free of the debt if he swore that he owed nothing; any one who advanced money on a written document could not receive back more than the capital and an equal value in interest. Only the property, not the person, of the debtor could be claimed by the creditor.<sup>157</sup> A decision of Bocchoris is preserved in Plutarch. An Egyptian youth was seized with love for the courtesan Thonis, who demanded a great sum of money. Then he dreamt that he had enjoyed her love, and his desire ceased; but she claimed the hire agreed upon before a court of law. When Bocchoris heard the plaint he ordered the defendant to put the sum of money demanded into a jar, to take this in his hand, and carry it backwards and forwards. The courtesan was to cling to the shadow: fancy was the shadow of reality.<sup>158</sup> In another passage Plutarch narrates that when Bocchoris was in an angry mood, Isis sent him an adder, that he might wind it round his head, and when overshadowed by it, give just judgment; an anecdote which obviously contains the explanation given by the Greeks of the Uraeus-diadem of the Pharaohs; though the connection of the story with Bocchoris speaks for his fame as a judge, a fame which he enjoyed among the Greeks, even at the time of Alexander, on the ground of Egyptian tradition. All these statements show that the "much sung" Bocchoris<sup>159</sup> was in the recollection of the Egyptians a ruler who again restored the royal power, fixed its conditions and preserved them by his judicial decisions; who brought about order and justice in all the transactions of life during a period of disturbance and confusion. This description is not belied by the statement which is also made, that he was covetous of money.<sup>160</sup> The crown was certainly not in a position to dispense with means, when mercenaries had become of such prime importance in Egypt.

We know nothing of any deeds of Bocchoris in war. We only find that he looked inactively on the great change which took place in Syria in the last decade of his reign. When Assyria planted her foot ever more firmly in Syria (p. 38), the eyes of Israel were directed to Egypt. When Gaza, the most southern fortress of Palestine, fell into the hands of the Egyptians, and the prince sought protection in Egypt (p. 48), we hear nothing of any arrangements of Bocchoris. No doubt he found himself threatened by a neighbour nearer and more dangerous. There are no monuments of Bocchoris in existence, with the exception of the sarcophagus of an Apis, which stood in the same chamber in which was placed the Apis which died in the thirty-seventh year of Ssheshonk IV. The name of the king is here Bokenranef.<sup>161</sup> This burial of the sacred bull of Memphis in the traditional manner contradicts the narratives of the Western writers, that Bocchoris did not observe the precepts of religion, and caused the sacred white bull of Ra at Heliopolis to fight against a wild bull, a proceeding which caused a rebellion among the Egyptians.<sup>162</sup> Statements of this kind, like the stories of portents, which happened in his time, – that a goat spoke, that a lamb was born with eight feet, two tails, two heads, and two horns, and spoke,<sup>163</sup> – are intended no doubt to supply a motive for and prepare the blow which fell upon Egypt and Bocchoris, and which the king's wisdom and justice could not prevent.

---

<sup>155</sup> Athenæus, p. 418; Diod. 1, 74.

<sup>156</sup> Diod. 1, 94.

<sup>157</sup> Diod. 1, 79.

<sup>158</sup> Plut. "Demetr." c. 27.

<sup>159</sup> Ælian. "Hist. An." 12, 3.

<sup>160</sup> Diod. 1, 94.

<sup>161</sup> Mariette, "Bab. Athen. Franc." p. 58-62.

<sup>162</sup> Ælian. "Hist. An." 11, 11.

<sup>163</sup> Ælian. *loc. cit.* 12, 3.

What Pianchi was unable to carry out was accomplished by his second successor, Sabakon.<sup>164</sup> From the books of Manetho nothing has been preserved beyond the observation, that Sabakon the Ethiopian took Bocchoris prisoner in war, and caused him to be burnt alive; Herodotus tells us that Sabakon, the king of the Ethiopians, marched through Egypt with a mighty army of his people, and the king of Egypt (Herodotus calls him Anysis) fled into the marshes. Sabakon was a mild ruler, and did not punish any Egyptian with death. Those who had committed an offence, he condemned to raise the dams which Sesostris had caused to be thrown up round the cities, according to the measure of the offence, and thus the cities of Egypt became far higher; "and highest of all, in my opinion," Herodotus adds, "was the city of Bubastis."<sup>165</sup> "Though by birth an Ethiopian," says Diodorus of Sabakon, "he surpassed his predecessors in piety and gentleness. Of this it is sufficient proof that he did away with the severest penalty, the penalty of death, and caused those who were condemned to death to perform task-work in chains in the cities, since he was of opinion that the reduction of the punishment would not only be an advantage to the condemned persons, but also bring great advantage to the cities." By these task-labourers he caused many dams to be raised, and many needful canals to be cut.<sup>166</sup> With the gentleness of Sabakon, thus praised by Herodotus and Diodorus, the statement of Manetho, that he burnt Bocchoris alive, and the statement of Herodotus, that he put to death Necho of Sais, do not very well agree.

The last Bubastites, Petubastis and Osorkon, had not been able to maintain the power of the crown against the lords of the districts, and the brave and skilful attempt to restore the power of the Pharaohs made by Tnephachtus and Bocchoris was wrecked. After Bocchoris succumbed to the Ethiopians in the year 730 B.C.<sup>167</sup> Egypt obeyed a foreign ruler. The king of Napata was also the Pharaoh of Egypt; Egypt and Meroe were united. The chief importance of the change thus

<sup>164</sup> De Rougé, "Mélanges d'Archéol." 1, 37, concludes from the monuments of Tirhaka and the statue of Ameniritis, that Kashta succeeded Pianchi, that Sabakon and the others are children of Kashta (?) According to Brugsch the – ka in Shabaka and Shabataka is the attached article of the Barabra language. Hence it is explained how Saba(ka) can become Seveh among the Hebrews, or Sabhi among the Assyrians. Cf. Oppert. "Mémoire sur les rapports de l'Égypte et de l'Assyrie," p. 12-14.

<sup>165</sup> Herod. 2, 137-141.

<sup>166</sup> Diod. 1, 45, 65.

<sup>167</sup> I have already been able to fix the end of the Ramessids, the date of the Tanites and Bubastites, by the date of the accession of Shishak in the Hebrew reckoning; the length of the dynasty of the Tanites in Manetho; and the length of the Bubastites as corrected by the monuments, and the synchronism of the first Olympiad for Petubastis. For the period from the end of the Bubastites to the accession of Sabakon, the important points are the seventh Olympiad for Bocchoris, and the sarcophagus of the Apis of Bokenranef. If Bocchoris came to the throne in the year 753 B.C., Ssheshonk IV. died in the year 780 B.C.; if this was the thirty-seventh or thirty-eighth of his reign, the successor of the Apis buried in the thirty-seventh year of Ssheshonk might certainly live to the year 748, the sixth year of Bocchoris according to my reckoning. It is decisive for Sabakon's accession in Egypt that Hoshea of Israel undoubtedly ascended the throne in 734 B.C. (p. 16, note; 48). Shalmanesar IV. of Assyria marched against Israel in the year 726 B.C., when he had discovered the conspiracy of Hoshea with Seveh (Sabakon, p. 69). Hoshea must, therefore, have negotiated with Seveh in 727 B.C. at the latest, and probably earlier. Sabakon must have been previously established on the throne of Egypt. He cannot, therefore, have conquered Egypt later than 730 B.C. Bocchoris therefore reigned 23 years (753-730 B.C.); the time which Manetho allots to Bocchoris, six years, is too short for the completion of his legislation and the attainment of that fame as a legislator which he left behind him, according to the account of the Greeks. That Tirhaka reigned over Meroe and Egypt in the year 702 at the latest, is proved by the battle of Eltekeh, which was fought in 701 B.C. (p. 125). If Seveh, who negotiated with Hoshea, is supposed to be Sabataka, the conquest of Egypt by Sabakon must be put in the year 739. The Apis discovered in the twenty-sixth year of Tirhaka and buried in the twentieth year of Psammetichus, shows that according to the chronology of that period, Psammetichus was regarded as the immediate successor of Tirhaka. According to the reign of 54 years allotted to him by Herodotus and Manetho, Psammetichus begins in 664 B.C., since his death is fixed with certainty in 610 B.C. If Tirhaka's reign over Egypt began in the year 703 B.C., the year 678 would be the twenty-sixth of his reign; the Apis lived down to the twentieth year of the reign of Psammetichus, *i. e.* down to the year 645 B.C. – consequently 30 years, an age (the number on the inscription is illegible), which even a less carefully tended bull might attain. Tirhaka reigned from 703 to 664 B.C., *i. e.* 39 years. If the lists of Manetho, according to our excerpts, allow him only 18 years (Syncellus gives 20), this is obviously due to the fact that the reigns of Stepinates, Nechepsus, and Necho, who ought to stand side by side with Tirhaka, with seven, six, and eight years, *i. e.* with 21 years in all, are deducted from the reign of Tirhaka, in order to place these three princes after him. To the predecessors of Tirhaka, Sabakon and Sebichus, Manetho allows eight and fourteen years. The monuments of Egypt show that Sabakon reigned at least 12 years; Sabakon must, therefore, according to these dates, have begun to reign in Egypt not later than 729 B.C. (664 + 39 + 26). The Assyrian monuments show that Sabakon fought with Sargon at Raphia in the year 720 B.C., and his successor negotiated with him; that Tirhaka fought with Sennacherib in Syria in 701 B.C., and that he was at war with Assurbanipal about the year 666 B.C.

accomplished lay in the fact that the valley of the Nile, from the mouths as far as Dongola, was united into one state; that the warlike power of Egypt, which had become extinct under the later Ramessids, and then was replaced by Libyan mercenaries to the ruin of Egypt, was now replaced by the unspent vigour of the Ethiopians; and the combination of the latter with the rich means and resources of Egypt availed to strengthen the country considerably, and restore her to her previous position. For the internal condition of Egypt the new sovereignty brought hardly any other change than this, that the rulers now found a strong point of support in their own land. The dynasties which, so far as we can see, Tnephachtus and Bocchoris overcame or removed, we find again at the head of their districts under the Ethiopians. It is possible that oppressed or expelled families among these invited or supported Sabakon's invasion of Egypt, just as in the preceding generation the princes of Upper Egypt summoned Pianchi to support them against the father of Bocchoris. That sovereigns and hereditary lords were at the head of the districts of Egypt under Sabaka and his successors of Meroe is beyond a doubt. Thus the rule of Sabakon and his Ethiopian successors might appear as a restoration of the old state of affairs in contrast to the innovations of Tnephachtus and Bocchoris, and the more so, as these rulers jealously adopted the national worship. We saw how earnest Pianchi was in visiting the temples of Egypt; how he offered sacrifice to his father Thot, his father Ptah, his father Ra, and saw the last in his shrine at Heliopolis; the memorial stone even assures us that of the princes who submitted to him he allowed those only to come into his presence at that time who had eaten no fish, *i. e.* who strictly observed the rules of purification. It was the reverence of the priests, the participation in the worship, the correct behaviour, in which Sabakon and his Ethiopian successors come forward as genuine followers of the Pharaohs, which appear to have won for Sabakon – who is to the Greeks the representative of the Ethiopian dynasty – that reputation for gentleness and justice which Herodotus and Diodorus repeat from the tradition of the Egyptians. At the temples at Memphis,<sup>168</sup> at Luxor, and Karnak, Sabakon undertook works of restoration. His name and title here are Raneferka Shabaka. On the pillars of the main gateway at Karnak the goddess Hathor embraces him; the inscription on this gate describes him as "the good god, the giver of life for ever, like the sun," and declares that he has received the tribute of the negroes, and the tribute of the Chalu, *i. e.* the inhabitants of Palestine. How the latter statement is to be explained will become clear afterwards; we shall see that Sabakon had much better reason to be silent about the events in Syria than to boast of them.

Sabakon died in the year 717 B.C.,<sup>169</sup> and left the empire over Napata and Egypt to his own son Sebichus, as Manetho calls him; Shabataka as the name is given on monuments at Memphis.<sup>170</sup> His successor was Tirhaka, the Taharka of the monuments. The list of Manetho describes him as not being the son of his predecessor. We do not know in what way he came to the throne of Egypt; it appears that he got the crown by force; we can only establish the fact that he obtained the sovereign power in the year 703 B.C.<sup>171</sup> Considerable relics of his buildings remain in his native land at Napata. Among them are especially prominent the ruins of a great temple, just as all the buildings there are

<sup>168</sup> Goodwin in Chabas, "Mélanges," 1, 249 ff.

<sup>169</sup> Among the Hebrews, the king with whom Hoshea of Israel (734-722 B.C.), negotiates is called Seveh (So). Sargon's inscriptions name the opponent against whom he fought at Raphia in the year 720 B.C. "Sabhi, Sar of the land of Muzur," and also "Sabhi Siltannu of Muzur." The inscription of Karnak gives Sabakon's (Shabaka's) twelfth year; we must, therefore, although Manetho's list allows him only eight years, assume that Sabakon was the opponent of Sargon at Raphia, as stated in a preceding note. If Sabakon died immediately after his twelfth year, he died in 717 B.C. The ruler of Egypt who pays tribute to Sargon in the year 716, is repeatedly called by the Assyrian inscriptions, "Pirhu (Pharaoh), Sar of Muzur." So in the cylinder of G. Smith ("Disc." p. 295), the ruler of Egypt, who unites with Ashdod in the year 711 B.C., is called "Pirhu Sar of Muzur;" finally, the prince who delivers up Yaman, when it has been mentioned that Yaman fled beyond Egypt into the border land of Miluhhi, is called by Sargon "Sar Miluhhi." The Pharaoh, Sar Muzur, whom we find on the throne of Egypt in 716 to 711 B.C., and the Sar Miluhhi, who gives up Yaman, can only be Shabataka-Sebichus, the successor of Sabakon.

<sup>170</sup> Mariette, "Monuments," pl. 29 e.

<sup>171</sup> Not much weight could be laid on the observation in the Palatine codex of Hieronymus (Jerome); Tarachus (ab Æthiopia duxit exercitum), Sebico interfecto Ægyptiis regnavit annis xx.; but in the inscription of Medinet Habu Tirhaka calls himself conqueror of Kemi, *i. e.* of Egypt.

wholly in Egyptian style.<sup>172</sup> In Egypt Tirhaka's name occurs frequently on the walls of Karnak. On the portals of the temple of Medinet Habu, we see him before the face of Ammon brandishing his war-club over ten bearded forms. The inscription tells us that he overcame the black land (Kemi, Egypt), and the red land; on a memorial stone of Dongola the names of the regions and tribes are given, which he subjugated there in the distant south; names quite unknown and inexplicable to us.<sup>173</sup> With Megasthenes it is the Ethiopian Tearkon (Tirhaka), a mighty warrior, who subjugated Libya, advanced as far as the Pillars of Hercules, and even crossed into Europe.<sup>174</sup> We shall see that as soon as he ascended the throne his attention was occupied in the East, and that he fought with success in Syria at this time. What he may have afterwards accomplished against the negroes, and perhaps against tribes of Libya, in almost thirty years we cannot ascertain accurately. The severest struggles awaited him in the last decade of his reign, in which a mighty opponent rose up against him, with whom he wrestled stubbornly but without success.

---

<sup>172</sup> Lepsius, "Briefe," s. 239, 275.

<sup>173</sup> Brugsch, "Geogr." 1, 163.

<sup>174</sup> Strabo, p. 61, 686, 687. Büdinger's view ("Ægypt. Forschung. Herodots," 2, 32), that we must recognise Tirhaka in the Etearchus of Herodotus might be adopted if the narrative did not too definitely point out travelling Cyrenæans as the source; and the founding of Cyrene cannot be carried back to the time of Tirhaka.

## CHAPTER IV. THE FIRST COLLISION OF ASSYRIA AND EGYPT

When Tiglath Pilezar ascended the throne of Assyria, he first compelled Babylonia to recognise his supremacy; after that he advanced into the table land of Iran, as far as Arachosia, and there at the least maintained his supremacy far and wide over the Medes. To the North he fought against Nairi and Urarti, against Kummukh and Tubal (743 B.C.); even the union into which the distressed princes of that region entered against him did not protect them; after a second subjugation the Tubal, *i. e.* the Tibarenes, received a prince from the hand of Tiglath Pilezar (735 B.C.). Meanwhile he had already overthrown Arpad in the West, which had resisted his predecessors so vigorously in a struggle which continued for three years; received tribute from Karchemish, Damascus, and Tyre; and placed the region of Amanus, Lebanon, Hadrach, and several districts of Hamath under Assyrian viceroys (742-740 B.C.). Two years afterwards the princes of Cilicia, of Hamath, of Byblus, Menahem king of Israel, and Zabibieh, the queen of the Arabs, submitted (738 B.C.). The appeal of Ahaz for help brought him again into Syria; after a struggle of three years Damascus was overthrown, Israel deprived of a portion of her population, and given to another prince, the cities of the Philistines conquered, the Ammonites, Moabites, and Edomites overthrown, and at length Samsieh, the queen of the Arabs, was defeated (734-732 B.C.). This complete subjugation of Syria was followed by new conflicts on the lower Euphrates. Nabu-sabzi and Kinziru were overpowered; Kinziru became a vassal of Babylon, and when Merodach Baladan paid homage at Sapiya, the dominion of Tiglath Pilezar extended to the shore of the Persian Gulf (731 B.C.). He now called himself king of Asshur and Babel, and in the last years of his reign received the tribute of tribes from the south of Arabia. After an eventful reign of 18 years which gained for Assyria the supremacy over Media, Syria, and Babylonia, Tiglath Pilezar died in the year 727 B.C.

His successor was Shalmanesar IV. No inscriptions have been preserved from the short reign of this king. The astronomical canon represents a change in the succession of Babylon at the death of Tiglath Pilezar; in the place of the joint reign of Chinzirus and Polus, in which we believed that we might recognise the supremacy of Tiglath Pilezar, obscurely given in Babylonian tradition under the name Polus (Phul), and the vassal-reign of Kinziru (p. 9), comes the reign of Elulæus in the year 726 B.C. That Chinzirus and Polus died in the same year, that Kinziru died in the same year as Tiglath Pilezar, would be remarkable, but by no means impossible. It is more probable that Shalmanesar found it advisable to make a change in the vassal king at Babylon, and that after his accession he placed Elulæus (Illuhillu) there as a vassal. Shalmanesar's attention was soon occupied in another direction.

Saved by the arms of Assyria from the overpowering advance of the Damascenes and Israelites, the Philistines and Edomites, Ahaz, king of Judah, had paid homage to Tiglath Pilezar at Damascus. "When Ahaz saw the altar which was at Damascus," so we are told by the Books of Kings, "he sent a pattern of it to Uriah the priest, and Uriah built the altar after this pattern, and when Ahaz came from Damascus he sacrificed on this altar, and offered burnt offerings and meat offerings, and poured out his drink offering, and sprinkled the blood of his thank offering on the altar. The iron altar, which stood before Jehovah, he removed, and the iron sea he took from the oxen and placed it on the pavement (II. 184). And Ahaz bade Uriah offer the burnt offering in the morning, and the meat offering in the evening, and the burnt and meat offering of the king, and all the sacrifices of the whole people of the land, on the new altar, and the king's entry he turned to the house of Jehovah for the king of Assyria."<sup>175</sup> According to this Ahaz, in order to prove his submission to his sovereign, altered the altar and arrangements of the temple at Jerusalem after the pattern of an altar on which

---

<sup>175</sup> 2 Kings xvi. 10-18.

he had seen Tiglath Pilezar sacrifice to his gods at Damascus, and the ritual there observed.<sup>176</sup> The high priest Uriah submitted. He not only allowed the king to sacrifice in person, against which the priesthood had contended in the case of Uzziah, but he altered the service of the temple according to the wishes of the king.

Judah was laid waste through her length and breadth. The Damascenes and the Israelites, the Philistines and the Edomites, had got the whole land into their power as far as the metropolis. Even from this heavy blow Judah would learn nothing. Instead of turning thankfully to Jehovah for rescue from such distress, the altars of the temples were altered after an Assyrian pattern. Isaiah saw this movement with the deepest indignation. "Your country is desolate; your cities are burned with fire; your land, strangers devour it in your presence. And the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers. Had not Jehovah left to us a small remnant, we had been as Sodom and Gomorrah. From the sole of the foot to the head there is no soundness in us, but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores; they have not been pressed out, nor bound up, nor mollified with ointment. Why should ye be stricken any more, and revolt any more? They are replenished from the east, and are soothsayers like the Philistines, and agree with the children of strangers. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib, but Israel knows him not."<sup>177</sup>

Israel suffered still more than Judah by the carrying away of the population of the northern and eastern districts, the land of Nephtali, and the land of Gilead. Hoshea reigned over the remainder from the year 734 (p. 48). According to the Books of Kings he set on foot a conspiracy, slew Pekah, and became king in his place; according to the inscriptions of Tiglath Pilezar, Tiglath made him king over Israel. These statements are not contradictory. Pekah had been in league with Rezin of Damascus, the opponent of Assyria and Judah: why should not Tiglath Pilezar recognise and establish as king of Israel the man who had removed the opponent of Assyria?<sup>178</sup> Hoshea sent his tribute yearly to the king of Assyria.<sup>179</sup> But when the dreaded warrior prince of Asshur – when Tiglath Pilezar died, there awoke in the Philistines, the Phenicians, and above all in Eulæus, king of Tyre, and Hoshea, king of Israel, the hope of withdrawing themselves from the yoke of Assyria. If Hoshea had risen as a partisan of Assyria, he determined now that he was in possession of the throne to break loose from that empire. The hope of liberation rested not only on the fact that Tiglath Pilezar was no more; it received a still stronger point of support in the change which had taken place in Egypt in the last years of Tiglath Pilezar. Menahem of Israel had already thought of securing the assistance of Egypt before he sent his tribute to Assyria (p. 38), and the same thought must have occurred to Uzziah in his last years. Hanno of Gaza had taken refuge in Egypt from Tiglath Pilezar (p. 48). The prudent Bocchoris had left, or been compelled to leave, Syria untouched. But since his reign Sabakon had united the forces of Dongola, Nubia, and Egypt into a strong power. When Tiglath Pilezar had extended the dominion of Assyria as far as Gaza and Elath, and a victorious aggressive power of great strength stood on the borders of Egypt, the attack of Assyria might be expected there. A far-seeing ruler of Egypt, secure of his military power, must endeavour to anticipate this attack; he must prevent it by uniting the elements of resistance existing in Syria. If the issue were favourable, the dominion of Assyria over Syria would thus be removed; in any case Egypt would have allies in Syria for the war against Assyria. "Hoshea sent messengers to Seveh (Sabakon) king of Egypt," so the Hebrews tell us, "and brought the king of Assyria no present more as formerly." It is this attempt to gain assistance, and probably the presents which accompanied it – perhaps also gifts from Hanno at Gaza, the princes of Tyre, Zemar, and Hamath (see below) – which Sabakon, on the walls of Karnak, describes as tribute received from the inhabitants of Palestine (p. 73).

---

<sup>176</sup> No one can seriously maintain that Ahaz imitated the ritual of the chief enemy of Assyria and Judah, the altar and worship of Rezin, who was moreover now overthrown.

<sup>177</sup> Isa. i. 3, 5-9; ii. 6.

<sup>178</sup> The Books of Kings are only wrong in representing Hoshea as first subject, and paying tribute, to Shalmanesar IV. (xvii. 3).

<sup>179</sup> 2 Kings xvii. 4.

Isaiah foresaw very plainly what would be the issue of this undertaking which to him appeared madness and intoxication. He announced destruction and ruin to the Philistines, the kingdom of Israel, and the Phenicians. The carrying away into captivity already sent by Jehovah upon Israel, in punishment of her offences, and the war against Judah had brought about no improvement, no reformation; the severe lesson teaching them to remain at rest, which the sons of Israel had then received, is disregarded; they are calling down upon themselves a still heavier judgment. Isaiah spoke the more strongly as he was desirous to prevent Judah also, where Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz, ascended the throne in 728 B.C., from joining in this attempt. In reference to the death of Tiglath Pileser he cries to the cities of the Philistines: "Rejoice not, whole Philistia, because the rod is broken which smote thee. For out of the serpent's root shall come forth a cockatrice, and his fruit is a flying serpent. From the north cometh a smoke."<sup>180</sup> To the cities of Tyre and Sidon, he cries: "Howl, ye ships of Tarshish, for Tyre is laid waste: there is no house more, no entering in. Be still, ye inhabitants of the coast, which the merchants of Sidon that pass over the sea replenished. By distant waters the seed of the Nile, the harvest of the river, was their revenue, and she was the mart of nations. Be thou ashamed, Sidon, for the sea hath spoken; the strength of the sea thus: I travailed not, and brought not forth; I brought up no young men and maidens. Pass ye over to Tarshish; howl, ye inhabitants of the coast! Is this your joyous city, whose antiquity is of ancient days? Her own feet shall carry her afar off to sojourn. Who hath taken this counsel against Tyre, the crowning city, whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers are the honourable of the earth? Jehovah the Lord of Hosts hath purposed it. Jehovah gave command over Canaan to destroy her fortresses, and said: Thou shalt no more rejoice, thou oppressed virgin, daughter of Sidon! Pass over to Chittim (the Cyprians, II. 53). There also thou shalt have no rest. When the report comes to Egypt, they shall be sorely pained at the report of Tyre."<sup>181</sup>

Isaiah directs his most severe warning to those of his own race, the kingdom of Israel. "Woe to the proud crown of the drunken Ephraim, the faded flower on the head of the fat valley of those possessed by wine," he cries. "Priests and prophets have erred through strong drink, and are overcome with wine. Jehovah will speak to this people with an alien tongue, to whom he said: Give ye rest to the weary; this is the way of salvation. But they would not listen. To whom shall he teach knowledge? whom shall he make to understand doctrine? – them that are weaned from the milk, and removed from the mother's breast? Behold, a stronger and mightier shall come from the Lord, as a tempest of hail, and a destroying storm; as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, he shall cast them with violence to the earth. He will trample it under foot, the proud crown of the drunken Ephraim; the faded flower on the head of the fat valley will disappear like early fruit before the gathering."<sup>182</sup>

"Shalmanesar the king of Assyria," so the Books of Kings tell us, "discovered a conspiracy in Hoshea, that he had sent messengers to Seveh (So), the king of Egypt, and brought him no more a present as before. He went up against Hoshea, seized him, and put him in chains in prison, and marched over the whole land, and against Samaria, and besieged the city three years." Josephus tells us: "It was told Shalmanesar that Hoshea had secretly invited Egypt to a combined struggle. In his anger he marched out against Samaria, besieged the city for three years, and took Hoshea prisoner." "But the king of Assyria fought against the whole of Syria and Phœnicia. He marched against Tyre while Elulæus reigned there. Menander, who has drawn up the annals and translated the archives of the Tyrians into the Greek language, vouches for this when he says: Elulæus reigned 36 years; when the Citians revolted, he sailed thither and again reduced them to subjection. The king of Assyria sent an expedition against these, overran all Phœnicia with war, made peace with them all, and returned. Sidon, and Acco, and old Tyre, and many other cities revolted from the Tyrians; but as the Tyrians

---

<sup>180</sup> Isa. xiv. 29-31.

<sup>181</sup> Isa. xxiii. 1-12.

<sup>182</sup> Isa. xxviii. 1-6.

themselves did not submit, the king turned again upon them, and the Phenicians manned 60 ships for him, and placed upon them 8000 rowers.<sup>183</sup> Against these the Tyrians set sail with 12 ships; destroyed the vessels of the enemy, and made about 500 prisoners. But the king of Assyria placed guards on the river, and on the conduits, to prevent the Tyrians from drawing water, and returned home. The Tyrians endured this for five years, during which they drank water from wells that they had dug. This is what is stated in the records of the Tyrians about Shalmanesar, the king of the Assyrians."<sup>184</sup>

According to these indications and statements we may assume the course of affairs to have been something of the following kind. The cities of the Phenicians, and of the Philistines, and the kingdom of Israel hope for the assistance of the king of Meroe and Egypt, of Sabakon, whom the Hebrews call Seveh, and the inscriptions of the Assyrians, Sabhi. Shalmanesar overruns Syria, before the assistance from Egypt has arrived there (726 B.C.).<sup>185</sup> Hoshea is either taken by surprise and overcome, or in his terror attempts to appease the king of Asshur by submission. He is carried away to prison, and Shalmanesar turns towards the coast. The cities of the Phenicians submit; only the island city of Tyre resists (II. 265). The cities, which had submitted, were now compelled to furnish ships to Shalmanesar for the conquest of Cyprus, and the blockade of the island city, which was carried on from the mainland also, since old Tyre was garrisoned there, and the inhabitants of the island city were prevented from drawing water on the coast. It is remarkable that the Tyrians are said to have met the 60 ships of the blockade with 12 ships only. Yet this is no doubt no more than a mere sally of the besieged. The ships of the inhabitants of the mainland may not have taken a vigorous part in the fighting; and the blockade may not have been carried on very strictly. Tyre may very well have been able to endure a somewhat lax investment for five years. The resistance of the Tyrians appears to have inspired courage in the Israelites and the metropolis of Israel, so that they defied the arms of the Assyrians even after the carrying away of Hoshea. In the year 724 B.C. Shalmanesar turned from the coast, against Samaria. The Israelites defended their city most stubbornly. Damascus had resisted Tiglath Pileasar two years; Samaria, like Arpad, held out for three years. "The king of Assyria took Samaria," so we are briefly told in the Books of Kings, "and carried Israel to Assyria, and gave them dwellings in Chalah and Chabor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."

The monuments of Assyria inform us that Shalmanesar IV. did not live to see the fall of Samaria. He died in the course of the last year of the siege (722 B.C.). Sargon, his successor, boasts of this achievement of his arms. "In the beginning of my reign," so we are told in the annals of Sargon, "I besieged the city of Samaria (Samarina), and took it with the help of the god Samas, who gives me victory over my enemies. I took 27,280 prisoners. I took 50 chariots as my royal portion. I brought them to Assyria, and in their place I put people whom my hand had reduced. I placed my officers and viceroys over them, and imposed tribute upon them as on the Assyrians."<sup>186</sup> This statement is repeated in the inscription which gives the more important acts of Sargon (the so called *fasti*), with this difference at the close: "My officers I placed over them; I imposed on them the tribute of the previous kings."<sup>187</sup> The inscription of the bulls says quite briefly: "He (Sargon) overthrew Samaria, and all the house of Omri."<sup>188</sup> The inscription on the cylinder says: "I have subjugated the great land of Bit Omri."<sup>189</sup> The annals recapitulate: "I have laid waste the region of Samaria, and the land of Bit Omri." After informing us that the king of Israel was carried away to the East, the Books of Kings tell us, like the annals of Sargon, that other inhabitants were settled in Israel: "He caused people to come from Babel and from Kutha, from Sepharvaim, Ava, and Hamath," and placed them in the cities of

<sup>183</sup> So must we read for 800; 60 penteconters required 3000; 60 triremes at least 8000 rowers.

<sup>184</sup> "Antiq." 9, 14, 2.

<sup>185</sup> As Samaria was besieged 724-722 B.C., we may place the beginning of the Assyrian war in 726.

<sup>186</sup> Oppert, "Dour Sarkayan," p. 8, 30; "Records of the Past," 7, 28; E. Schrader, "K. A. T." s. 160; Ménant, "Annal." p. 161.

<sup>187</sup> E. Schrader, *loc. cit.* s. 158; Ménant, "Annal." p. 181.

<sup>188</sup> L. 26, in Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 192.

<sup>189</sup> L. 17, in Ménant, p. 200.

Samaria in the room of the children of Israel.<sup>190</sup> Sargon's own account confirms this statement; his inscriptions show us further to what stock these settlers belonged. In the year 721 B.C., very soon after the capture of Samaria, he transplanted people from Babylonia to the land of the Chatti, *i. e.* to Syria.<sup>191</sup> We are also told that people were removed from the four districts of Armenia to Syria, to the coast;<sup>192</sup> and finally, that people of Arabian descent, "of Thammud, Marsiman, Chayapa, and the land of Bari," were settled in the city of Samaria. The strengthening of the alien element in Samaria was caused by the fact that the Israelites, in spite of the severe punishment which they had undergone, had nevertheless attempted to rebel once more against Assyria.<sup>193</sup>

The carrying away of the inhabitants of Naphtali and Gilead, which Tiglath Pileasar had executed, the removal into a new environment, which Sargon now carried out twelve years after the former deportation, were blows from which the ten tribes could not again recover. Not that the existence of the people was annihilated; many, no doubt, perished in the conquest of the land and metropolis, yet it was by no means the whole remnant that was carried away. It was only a part of the population on whom that severe lot descended. Isaiah tells us Jehovah punished the people by measure, and allowed a remnant to remain.<sup>194</sup> The number of those who remained was sufficient to gain the preponderance in a population so strongly mixed with foreign settlers.<sup>195</sup> Yet this admixture sapped the national vigour at the core. In the inscriptions of the Assyrians we hear no more of the land of Omri, but only of Samaria; from them we see that kings remained at the head of the land; they mention a second Menahem and an Abibaal as kings of Samaria. The community over which the descendants of David ruled was, in the first place, only anxious for the preservation of the national life and faith. Judah remained obedient to Assyria. Hezekiah of Judah looked on at the long siege of Samaria, the death-struggle of Israel, and the carrying away of his kindred without moving. He must have paid his tribute regularly. An inscription of Sargon, belonging to the first years of his reign, enumerates the "distant Judah" among the subject lands.<sup>196</sup>

The subjugation of the Phenicians, the punishment of Israel for her defection, did not break the hopes which the Syrians reposed in Egypt. Two years after the fall of Samaria, Egypt may have been better prepared for war, for a march into Syria, than at the time of Shalmanesar's campaign against Hoshea and the Phenicians. Egypt's power appeared nearer at hand; Sargon had to advance from the Tigris. Hamath rebelled against Assyria. "Ilubid possessed himself of the crown of Hamath," so we are told in the inscriptions of Sargon; "he took the city of Karkar, and roused the cities of Arpad, Damascus, Zemar (Simyra), and Samaria against me. I besieged him and his warriors in the city of Karkar."<sup>197</sup> The city of Karkar, near which, 130 years before, Benhadad of Damascus and Ahab of Israel had fought against Shalmanesar II., was taken; Ilubid was captured, and Sargon caused him to be flayed – a relief in the palace of Sargon exhibits the execution of this sentence.<sup>198</sup> The memorial stone of Larnaka says: "Ilubid of Hamath rebelled; I fought against him, and covered the land of Hamath with ruins." Sixty-three thousand people were transplanted from Assyria into the land of Hamath.<sup>199</sup>

But Sargon succeeded in becoming master of a mightier opponent, in maintaining Syria against Egypt. Sabakon had marched through the desert with the forces of Ethiopia and Egypt; Hanno of Gaza, who once retired to Egypt before Tiglath Pileasar, joined him with his warriors. Sargon went

<sup>190</sup> 2 Kings xvii. 6, 24.

<sup>191</sup> "The Annals of Sargon," Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 29.

<sup>192</sup> Oppert, *loc. cit.* 7, 30.

<sup>193</sup> G. Smith, "Assyr. Canon," p. 125, 126.

<sup>194</sup> Isa. xi. 6-8; 2 Chron. xxx. 6, 10; xxxiv. 9.

<sup>195</sup> 2 Kings xvii. 26 ff.

<sup>196</sup> Inscription of Nimrud, in Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 205; in E. Schrader, *loc. cit.* p. 90.

<sup>197</sup> "Annals of Sargon," Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 29; G. Smith, *loc. cit.*

<sup>198</sup> In the great hall No. 8, in Botta. Ménant, p. 182.

<sup>199</sup> Memorial-stone of Larnaka, in Ménant, p. 207; G. Smith, "Assyr. Canon," p. 127.

to meet them. The armies met at Raphia (now Refah, between El Arish and Gaza, where at a later period Ptolemy Philopator of Egypt overcame Antiochus the Great). "Sabhi trusted in his forces," so the annals of Sargon tell us, "and came to meet me to offer me battle. I called upon the great god Asshur, my lord; I smote them. Sabhi fled with a shepherd, who kept the sheep, and escaped. Hanno I took prisoner. All that he possessed I carried away to Assyria. I laid waste and destroyed his cities, and burned them with fire. I carried away 9033 men with their possessions."<sup>200</sup> The introduction to the annals and the inscription on the bulls say briefly: "The armies of the land of Muzur (Egypt) he (Sargon) defeated near the city of Raphia (Raphi). Hanno, the king of Gaza, he brought into slavery."<sup>201</sup> The inscription of the cylinder says: "Near the city of Raphia I defeated the king of Muzur; the king of the land of Gaza I took prisoner and carried to Assyria." The Fasti of Sargon inform us: "Hanno, king of Gaza, marched with Sabhi, the sultan of Egypt (*siltannu mussuri*), to meet me near the city of Raphia, to offer me battle and conflict. I put them to flight. Sabhi was seized with fear of the might of my arms; he fled, and not a trace of him was seen. Hanno, the king of Gaza, I took captive with my own hand."<sup>202</sup>

Sargon's contests in Syria did not end with the battle at Raphia (720 B.C.). After the inscription on the bulls has narrated the victory over the army of Egypt, it continues immediately: "I fought against the tribes of the Thammud, Ibadid, Marsiman, and Chayapa, who had invaded the land of Bit Omri, *i. e.* Israel."<sup>203</sup> On the other hand, the annals tell us, under Sargon's seventh year (716 B.C.): "I marched against the tribes of Tasid, Ibadid, Marsiman, and Chayapa; against the distant dwellers in the land of Bari, which the scholars and the wise knew not. None of the kings my forefathers had heard this name. I compelled them to obey Asshur, and those who remained I drove out of their dwellings, and placed them in the city of Samaria." On this campaign Sargon must have advanced into the peninsula of Sinai, and far into Arabia, for the annals continue: "Pharaoh (Pirhu), the king of Egypt (Muzur), Samsieh the queen of the Arabs, Iathamir the Sabæan, are kings from the distant coast of the sea and from the land (chasm). As their tribute I received herbs of the East of various kinds, metals, horses, and camels."<sup>204</sup> The Fasti, which compress events, have the following words after the account of the battle of Raphia: "I received the tribute of Pharaoh the king of Egypt, of Samsieh the queen of the Arabs, of Iathamir the Sabæan; gold, herbs, horses, camels."<sup>205</sup> We remember that Samsieh, like the Sabæans, had already paid tribute to Tiglath Pileser.

The stubborn obstinacy of the Syrians was not broken even by the desolation of Hamath and the battle at Raphia. Building on the assistance of Shabataka of Meroe and Egypt, the son and successor of Sabakon, Ashdod, the city of the Philistines, revolted in the eleventh year of Sargon, *i. e.* in the year 711 B.C. The hope in Egypt was shared by their neighbours in Judah, Edom, and Moab. But Ashdod was soon invested by the Assyrians and taken, and the invasion of Egypt by the Assyrians was expected in Judah. In Isaiah we are told: "In the year in which Tartan, *i. e.* the Assyrian general-in-chief, came unto Ashdod, when Sargon sent him, and besieged Ashdod and took it, at that time spoke Jehovah: Go and loose the sackcloth from thy loins, and put off the shoes from thy feet; and Isaiah did so, and walked naked and barefoot. Then spake Jehovah: As my servant Isaiah has walked naked and barefoot three years for a sign and wonder upon Egypt and Ethiopia (Cush), so shall the king of Assyria lead the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, with their nakedness uncovered, to the shame of Egypt. Then shall they be ashamed of Ethiopia their expectation, and of Egypt their glory. And the inhabitants of these coasts said on the

<sup>200</sup> Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 29; E. Schrader, "K. A. T." 258; Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 161.

<sup>201</sup> Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 159, 192.

<sup>202</sup> E. Schrader, *loc. cit.* s. 258.

<sup>203</sup> Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 34.

<sup>204</sup> Communication from E. Schrader.

<sup>205</sup> E. Schrader, "K. A. T." s. 258; Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 181.

same day: Behold, such is our expectation, whither we fled for help, to be delivered from the king of Assyria: how shall we escape?"<sup>206</sup>

Sargon's annals tell us: "Azuri, the king of Ashdod, lifted up his spirit to disobedience, so as to pay his tribute no longer. He sent messages hostile to Assyria to his neighbours. I bethought me of vengeance, and put another ruler over his land. I raised his brother Achimit to the throne, but the people of the Chatti inclined to rebellion, and were weary of the reign of Achimit, and raised to the throne Yaman, who had no right to it. In the anger of my heart I marched with my warriors against Ashdod. I besieged, I took Ashdod and Gimt-Asdodim; with the gods which inhabit these cities I took the gold, the silver, and all that was in his palace. Then I restored these cities; I placed people whom I had subjugated in them. I put my viceroy over them, treated them as Assyrians, and they were obedient."<sup>207</sup> The much injured inscription of a cylinder informs us that "Sargon, in the ninth year of his reign (713 B.C.), when he had come to the shore of the great sea, and Philistæa, displaced Azuri of Ashdod, because he had hardened his heart to pay tribute no longer, and had sent to the kings, the enemies of Assyria. Before the face of Azuri I exalted his brother Achimit, and laid taxes and tribute on him as on the kings round about him. But the people would not pay taxes and tribute, rebelled against him, and drove him out for the good that he had done them. Yaman, who had no right to the throne, they made their lord, and armed and fortified their cities for war." "The nations of Philistæa, Judah, Edom, and Moab, though they brought their tribute and presents to the god Asshur, spoke treachery like their evil kings; in order to fight against me, they sent gifts to Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, a prince who could not save them, and besought his alliance." "I preserved the honour of Asshur; I crossed the Tigris and Euphrates in the height of the flood." "When Yaman heard of my campaign against the land of the Chatti, the fear of Asshur, my lord, overcame him. He fled to the borders of Egypt, to the border-land of Meroe (Miluhhi); to a distant place he fled, and his hiding-place was not discovered."<sup>208</sup> The introduction to the annals of Sargon tells us: "Yaman had misjudged my power; he fled to the borders of the land of Meroe."<sup>209</sup> In the Fasti of Sargon we learn: "Yaman heard of the approach of my army; he fled to a region of Egypt which lies on the border of Meroe: not a trace of him was seen. I besieged, I took Ashdod and Gimt-Asdodim: his gods, his consort, his sons, his treasures, possessions, the costly things of his palace, and all the inhabitants of his land I destined to captivity." The annals tell us at the very beginning: "Yaman of Ashdod, who despised my power, fled into the lands of the South, to the borders of Meroe. The king of Meroe was overcome by the fear of Asshur; he bound his (Yaman's) hands and feet with iron chains, and sent his messengers before my face to Assyria."<sup>210</sup> The Fasti say: "The king of Meroe, in a desolate region, whose fathers had not sent ambassadors to my royal forefathers to entreat for peace – the power of Merodach, a mighty terror, overcame him; fear seized him. He put him (Yaman) in iron chains; he guided his steps to Assyria, and he appeared before me."<sup>211</sup> From these statements it follows, that the army of Egypt, in which Yaman of Ashdod hoped, on whose forces the rest of the cities of the Philistines, Judah, Edom, and Moab reckoned in order to rebel against Assyria, as Isaiah and Sargon told us, never came. It was no doubt again the unexpected celerity with which the Assyrian army appeared before Ashdod in the year 711 B.C. (Sargon has told us already that he crossed the Tigris and Euphrates at the time of the flood), which destroyed all these plans. But the invasion of Egypt and Napata by the Assyrians, which Isaiah expected and announced, did not take place; according to Sargon's statement, Shabataka preferred to avert the attack of the Assyrians by surrendering Yaman.

<sup>206</sup> Isa. xx. 1 ff.

<sup>207</sup> Oppert, *loc. cit.* 7, 40; Ménant, p. 169; cf. l. 12 of the inscription on the bulls in Ménant, p. 162.

<sup>208</sup> G. Smith's Cylinder, "Disc." p. 289 ff.

<sup>209</sup> Ménant, p. 159.

<sup>210</sup> Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 26.

<sup>211</sup> E. Schrader, "K. A. T." s. 257 ff.; cf. Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 186.

At the commencement of his annals Sargon tells us, that he imposed tribute on the kings of the land of Yatnan, who dwelt at a distance of seven days' voyage in the sea of the setting sun.<sup>212</sup> The Fasti narrate: "The seven kings of Yatnan, whose names none of the kings, my fathers, nor any one in Assyria and Babylonia, had heard of, received intelligence of my victories in the land of the Chaldæans and the Chatti. My glory spread to the midst of the sea. They bowed their pride; they humbled themselves; they appeared at Babylon before me, and brought gold, silver, vessels, the products of their land." Yatnan is the island of Cyprus; the seven days' journey is the distance from Tyre to Citium, about 150 miles. The payment of the tribute of the seven kings of Cyprus took place in 709 B.C. Hence we may assume that after the punishment of Ashdod and the surrender of Yaman, Sargon's dominion was established in Syria, and that Tyre submitted like the other cities of the Phenicians. Hence the princes of Cyprus might consider it advisable to pay homage to the king, unless perhaps they sought in him a point of support against Tyre. As a symbol of his dominion over Cyprus, Sargon caused his image to be engraved on a memorial stone in the usual manner, and set it up at Citium in the midst of the island; it is now in the Berlin Museum. The inscription gives the extent of the dominion of Sargon; relates the most important events of his reign; mentions the temples he has built, the offering of the tribute of the seven princes of the land of Yatnan at Babylon – then the erection of the image – and threatens with curses and annihilation those who alter the tablet and change Sargon's name or anything else written on the tablet: if any one attempts such a thing, Nebo and the gods who dwell in the middle of the wide sea will destroy him and his race.<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>212</sup> Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 159.

<sup>213</sup> Ménant, p. 189, 206-208. That the stone cannot have been set up in Babylon before the payment of tribute in 709B.C., is proved by the mention of the tribute upon it. Cp. G. Smith, "Z. Ægypt. Sprache," 1869, s. 109; 1870, s. 70, 71.

## CHAPTER V. ASSYRIA IN THE REIGNS OF SARGON AND SENNACHERIB

In his inscriptions Sargon speaks of the kings who ruled over Asshur before him, but he mentions neither his father nor his grandfather, though these are regularly mentioned by all the other kings of Assyria who ascended the throne in direct succession. It follows that he was neither the son nor the grandson of Shalmanesar IV.; nevertheless he was one of the mightiest, most victorious, and powerful of the rulers of Assyria. Nor did the uninterrupted series of his campaigns prevent him from undertaking and carrying out great buildings. To the two ancient chief cities of Assyria – Asshur and Nineveh – Shalmanesar I. had added Chalah, which was subsequently adorned by Assurnasirpal, Shalmanesar II. and Tiglath Pileser II. with temples and palaces. Sargon built a new residence in the neighbourhood of Nineveh. On the course of the Khosr, which flows through ancient Nineveh into the Tigris, ten miles up the stream, he built a new royal abode, which he called after his name Dur Sarrukin, *i. e.* fortress of Sargon. The new city (Khorsabad) formed, as the remains of the outer walls show, a rectangle, each of the shorter sides of which measures more than 5000, and each of the longer sides 5500 feet.<sup>214</sup> In the north-west front of the outer wall the palace, surrounded by a separate wall, rose above the rectangle of the new city. The outer walls of the city were 45 feet in thickness; they were built up in brick, on a basis of stone; the outer wall of the palace, which flanked as a fortress the north-western side of the city wall, was entirely cased with stone.<sup>215</sup> The entrance to the main structure of the royal fortress was guarded by two human-headed bulls. The halls were adorned with reliefs, which exhibit the exploits of the king. Here was to be seen the execution of Ilubid, king of Hamath (p. 88); the besieging and storming of cities. Over the reliefs, beginning from the entrance in the form of a broad frieze, an inscription runs toward the left round the hall, which explains the pictures on the reliefs and ends on the opposite side of the entrance. In some halls this frieze forms a connected narrative, which relates the acts of the king in succession according to the years of the reign (the so-called Annals). In the great gallery and the chambers abutting on it the inscriptions are shorter: here they are content with bringing into prominence the most important acts of the king (the so-called Fasti). The two bulls at the entrance of the palace are also covered with inscriptions. In the foundations of the palace was found a stone chest, in which lay seven plates of gold, silver, tin, copper, lead, alabaster, and marble, on which are inscriptions as well as on the clay cylinders found in the ruins. On the bricks of the palace we read: "Palace of Sarrukin the viceroy of Bel, Patis of Asshur (II. 31), the mighty king, king of the nations, king of Asshur." And on the gold plate: "Palace of Sarrukin, viceroy of Bel, Patis of Asshur, the mighty king, king of the nations, king of Asshur, who rules from the rising to the setting sun, over the four regions of the world, and places viceroys over them. According to my pleasure I have built a city in the neighbourhood of the mountains, and given to it the name of Fortress of Sarrukin. For Salman, Sin, Samas, Bin, and Adar, I have built dwellings for their great divinities in the midst of the city. The glory of my name I have inscribed on tablets of gold, silver, copper, lead, tin, alabaster, and marble, and placed them in the foundations of the palace. Whoso injures the works of my hand, and robs my treasure, may Asshur, the great lord, destroy his name and seed."<sup>216</sup> The Annals mention this palace in the year 712 B.C.; at the close they

---

<sup>214</sup> Flandin gives the long and short sides of the rectangle doubled at 6784 metres; the inscription which reckons in the whole circuit the building of the palace which juts out from the rest, at 16,280 cubits (*ammāt*). The Babylonian and Assyrian cubits are both = 525 millimetres; Lepsius, "Abh. Berl. Akad." 1853; "Monats-Berichte Ders." 1877. Vol. I. p. 305.

<sup>215</sup> Rawlinson, "Monarch," 12, 324 ff.

<sup>216</sup> Oppert, "Dour Sarkayan," p. 23, 24.

speak of the completion of it in the year 706 B.C. "With the heads of the provinces, the viceroys, the wise men, I settled down in my palace, and exercised justice."<sup>217</sup> In the inscriptions on the bulls, as well as on a cylinder, the king says, that he has named the gates to the East after Samas and Bin; those to the West after Anu and Istar; and those to the South after Bel and Bilit; those to the North after Salman and the lady of the gods.<sup>218</sup>

Sargon's predecessor, Shalmanesar IV., as we were able to assume, placed Elulæus over Babylon as a vassal king. The astronomical canon observes that the reign of Elulæus came to an end in 722 B.C., the same year in which Shalmanesar IV. died, and Merodach Baladan (Mardokempados) ascended the throne of Babylon in the year 721 B.C. We may suppose that this Merodach Baladan was no other than the prince of Bit Yakin, *i. e.* of South Chaldæa, who had submitted ten years before to Tiglath Pileasar at Sapiya (731 B.C.). He must have availed himself of the decease of Shalmanesar, and the occupation of the Assyrian army in Syria, which was detained before Samaria, to make himself master of Babylon from the South, and unite the whole region of Babylonia under his rule. As soon as Samaria fell, Sargon turned against him. In the Annals, the account of the capture of Samaria is followed, in the very first year of Sargon (722-721 B.C.), by a campaign against Humbanigas, the king of Elam, who, as the Fasti say, was defeated "in the plains of Kalu."<sup>219</sup> The Annals then continue: "Merodach Baladan, who had made himself lord of the kingdom of Babylon against the will of the gods." The destruction of the remainder of the narrative has left only a few words legible, from which we may gather that Sargon fought against Merodach Baladan, that he removed people from Babylonia to the land of the Chatti, *i. e.* to Syria: according to the Books of Kings these were inhabitants of Sepharvaim and Kutha (p. 86). Whatever losses Merodach Baladan suffered, in this way he retained Babylon and the throne. The astronomical canon represents him as reigning from 721 B.C. to 710 B.C. Clay tablets in the shape of lentils, found in the ruins of Sargon's palace at Khorsabad (they were brought there, no doubt, as booty from Babylonia), bear the date of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh years of Marduk-habaliddin, king of Babylon (*sar Babilu*<sup>220</sup>); even Sargon's Annals represent Merodach Baladan as ruling over Sumir and Accad for twelve years (*i. e.* from 721 to 709 B.C.).

After the war against Humbanigas and Merodach Baladan, against Elam and Babylonia, Sargon, as we saw, marched to Syria in order to subjugate Hamath and Gaza, and to defeat at Raphia (720 B.C.) the army of the Egyptians and Ethiopians led by Sabakon. In the next years Sargon fought in the north against the people of Van, who had shaken off the dominion of Iranzu, an adherent of Assyria, and against Urza of Ararat; the inhabitants of the four cantons in Armenia he removed to the land of Chatti, and the land of Acharri, *i. e.* to Syria and the Syrian coast.<sup>221</sup> After this, in the year 717 B.C., Pisiris of Karchemish, who had paid tribute to Tiglath Pileasar, was reduced. Karchemish was taken, Pisiris put in chains, the rebels carried to Assyria, and Assyrians placed in Karchemish. From the booty of Karchemish 11 talents of gold, 2100 talents and 24 minæ of silver were brought into the treasury at Chalah.<sup>222</sup> Urza of Ararat and prince Bagadatti of Mount Mildis (perhaps the region of Melitene, Malatia) excited the people of Van to rebellion, as Sargon says; Aza, the prince of Van, was slain. Sargon terrified the rebels into submission, caused Bagadatti to be flayed at the same place where Aza was slain, and placed Ullusun, the brother of Aza, on the throne of Van. But Ullusun united with Urza of Ararat and the princes of Karalla and Allabur. When Sargon advanced, Ullusun submitted; Sargon allowed him to remain on the throne on condition that he paid heavier tribute; the prince of Karalla was driven out, the people of Allabur carried to Hamath (715 B.C.<sup>223</sup>); in Ararat,

<sup>217</sup> Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 55, 56.

<sup>218</sup> Oppert, "Dour Sarkayan," p. 8.

<sup>219</sup> In Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 181.

<sup>220</sup> Oppert, "Dour Sarkayan," p. 27, 28; Oppert et Ménant, "Doc. juridiques," p. 168.

<sup>221</sup> Ménant, "Annal." 162. In Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 30, the fourth canton is called Pappa. Above, p. 86.

<sup>222</sup> Inscription of Nimrud in Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 206. He reads two talents 30 minæ of gold; G. Smith reads 11 talents of gold.

<sup>223</sup> Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 32.

Urza maintained his position. Vassurmi, the king of the Tabal, the Tibarenes, had been dethroned by Tiglath Pilezar, and Chulli put in his place (p. 11). Sargon allowed Ambris to succeed his father in the government of the Tabal, gave him his own daughter to wife, and intrusted him with the government of the Cilicians in addition to the Tabal. Ambris abused this confidence. He united with Mita, the king of the Moschi, with Urzana of Mussasir (which must, no doubt, be sought on Lake Van), and Urza of Ararat against Assyria. Ambris was defeated and taken prisoner, and carried to Assyria with his chief adherents. Mita submitted, like the Cilicians: Mussasir, the city of Urzana, was taken by storm: Urza of Ararat, whose resistance had been the longest and most stubborn, wandered about as a fugitive, and took his own life (714 B.C.).<sup>224</sup>

The armies of Shalmanesar II. were the first to make an advance on the table-land of Iran. As already remarked, they trod the plains of Media in 835 B.C. Ninety years later, Tiglath Pilezar II. subjugated the land of Nisaa (the region of Nisæa in Media) and then the cities of Media, on his first, second, and ninth campaigns; he imposed tribute on the princes of the land of Media. Sargon tells us that in his sixth year (716 B.C.) he fought against the land of Karkhar, which we must seek in the Zagrus (perhaps it is a part of the valley of the Kerkha); that he named a city there Kar Sargon. He received considerable tribute from 25 princes of the Medes, and set up his image in the midst of their places.<sup>225</sup> In the next year, when Urza of Ararat conspired with Ullusun of Van, and Ullusun with Dayaukka, the overseer of Van (?), "I took 22 fortresses," so the Annals say, "and carried away Dayaukka and his tribute with me, and restored peace to the land of Van" (715 B.C.).<sup>226</sup> The Fasti also mention the capture of the 22 places; after this they give the capture of Bagadatti, and continue: "I caused him to be flayed, and carried Dayaukka with his adherents away into the land of Amat, and made them dwell there."<sup>227</sup> "In order to maintain myself in Media, I built fortresses in the neighbourhood of Kar Sargon," so the Annals relate in the same year,<sup>228</sup> "and received the tribute of 22 princes of the Medes." To the erection of fortresses in the neighbourhood of Kar Sargon the Fasti add: "I conquered 34 cities in Media, united them with Assyria, and imposed on them a tribute of horses."<sup>229</sup> In the year 713 B.C., according to the statement in the Annals, Sargon marched against Bit Dayauku, and against the nation of Karalla, who had driven out Sargon's viceroy. "The lands of Bit Ili, the district of Media, which belongs to Ellip – and the chief districts of Media, which had thrown off Asshur's yoke, and put mountains and vallies in terror – I pacified. I received the tribute of 45 princes of the Medes; 4609 horses, sheep, and asses in great numbers."<sup>230</sup> The much-injured inscription of an octagonal cylinder enumerates the princes of Media who paid this tribute in this year: among them we find Pharnes, Barzan, Aspabara, Satarparnu, Ariya, and finally Arbaku of Arnasia.<sup>231</sup> Sargon's inscriptions repeatedly boast that he subjugated "the distant land of Media; all places of the distant Media as far as the borders of the land of Bikni;" that "his power extended as far as the city of Simaspati, which belonged to the distant Media in the East."<sup>232</sup>

When Syria had been reduced, Egypt repelled, the North brought into obedience, and Media made tributary, Sargon undertook to restore the supremacy of Assyria over Babylonia. Merodach Baladan's rule must be removed. The dominion of Assyria must be again restored as it was in the time of Tiglath Pilezar. "For twelve years," so the Fasti of Sargon tell us, "Merodach Baladan had roused up the land of Sumir and Accad. I resolved to march against the inhabitants of the land of

<sup>224</sup> Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 35, 36, 37. Vol I., p. 520.

<sup>225</sup> Annals in Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 164.

<sup>226</sup> Annals in Ménant, p. 164; Oppert, *loc. cit.* 7, 33.

<sup>227</sup> Ménant p. 183.

<sup>228</sup> Oppert, *loc. cit.* 7, 34.

<sup>229</sup> Ménant, p. 184.

<sup>230</sup> Ménant p. 167; Oppert, *loc. cit.* 7, 37.

<sup>231</sup> G. Smith, "Disc." p. 289.

<sup>232</sup> Oppert, *loc. cit.* 7, 27; Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 192, 195, 200, 201, 205, 207.

Kaldi (Chaldæa). Merodach Baladan heard of the approach of my army; he left Babylon, betook himself to Dur Yakin, strengthened the walls there, and called upon the tribes of Gambul, Pekod, Tumun, Ruhua, and Chindar. My warriors defeated the enemy. The migratory tribes fled after this defeat. Merodach Baladan left his tent, the insignia of his royal dignity, his chariot and adornments behind him, and fled away in the night. I besieged and took the city of Dur Yakin. His wife, his sons, his daughters, his palace, and all that was therein, I took. I burnt the city, and threw down the old walls. I permitted the inhabitants of Sippara, of Nipur, of Babylonia, and Borsippa to continue their occupations. To the cities of Arak (Erech) and Larsam (Senkereh) I gave back the gods which dwell there, and restored the temples."<sup>233</sup> The Annals give a more detailed account, but in the narrative of these events the text is interrupted by great lacunæ. In the introduction we have: "Merodach Baladan showed the greatest violence against the will of the gods of Babylon; my hand reached him; I took from him all his land." Then follows the narrative of the occurrence under the twelfth year of the king (710 B.C.): "Merodach Baladan refused to pay tribute. He had concluded an alliance with Sutruk Nanchundi, the king of Elam, and aroused all the tribes of Aram (Mesopotamia) against me. He strengthened his fortresses and assembled his troops. I took captive 18,430 men." After an enumeration of the cities which Sargon took, and the narrative of the subjection of the Pekod, we are told: "The rest of the inhabitants of the land of Aram had put their hopes in Merodach Baladan and Sutruk Nanchundi, and gathered on the river Uknî. I put them to flight." After this Sargon takes several cities of Elam; Sutruk Nanchundi retires before him into the mountains. Merodach Baladan heard this in his palace at Babylon; he left the city at night with his warriors, directed his steps to the land of Elam, and sent a considerable weight of silver to Sutruk Nanchundi, to induce him to send aid. "I marched at once to Babylon, sacrificed to the gods, and set up my power in the midst of the palace of Merodach Baladan." "In the thirteenth year of my reign, Merodach Baladan compelled the cities of Ur and Larsam to pay him tribute, collected his forces at Dur Yakin, and there fortified himself. I went boldly against him, threw his warriors and horses into confusion; I cut down the people of the Pekod and Marsiman, and took the symbols of their kingdom. And Merodach Baladan acknowledged his weakness; he abandoned the sceptre and throne, and kissed the earth in the presence of my emissary. I summoned him, and received him into favour. Dur Yakin I burnt; I laid regular tribute on the upper and lower land of Bit Yakin. While I punished the Chaldæans and Aramæans, and made my power felt by the Elamites, my viceroy, in the land of Kui (Cilicia), in the regions of the setting sun, attacked Mita, the Moschian, took two fortresses and 2400 men, freemen and slaves. To complete his subjugation, Mita sent his envoy with his tribute as far as the coast of the Eastern sea, and acknowledged the power of the god Asshur. The seven kings of Yatnan (Cyprus) also brought their tribute into my presence at Babylon; gold, silver, and the products of their land, and kissed my feet."<sup>234</sup>

These accounts show that Sargon's war against Merodach Baladan occupied two years (710 and 709 B.C.). In the first campaign the Babylonians were defeated in the field; the Aramæans dispersed; the Elamites, among whom the sovereignty had been meanwhile transferred from Humbanigas to Sutruk Nanchundi, driven back, and the cities of Babylonia taken. Merodach Baladan abandons Babylon, and retires to the lower Euphrates, to the land of his nation. Sargon ascends the throne of Babylon, and takes the title, "King of Babel, of Sumir and Accad," which Tiglath Pilezar had borne before him. The second campaign ends with the capture and destruction of Dur Yakin, with the subjugation of the whole region of the Euphrates as far as the shore of the Persian Gulf, and the receiving of Merodach Baladan into favour. According to the astronomical canon, Arkeanus ascended the throne of Babylon in the year 709 B.C. Arkeanus can only be Sargon (Sarrukin). One of the tablets, which contains contracts about the sale of parcels of land, slaves, and loans, from the time

---

<sup>233</sup> In Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 188.

<sup>234</sup> Above, p. 93; Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 46-51.

of Sargon, bears the date: "Month Sebat, year of Muttakkil-Assur, viceroy of Gozan; fifteenth year of Sargon, king of Asshur, third year of his reign in Babylon."<sup>235</sup> As Sargon certainly cannot have ascended the throne of Babylon later than the year 709 B.C., the year 707-706 would be the third year of his reign over Babylonia; the canon of the Assyrian rulers actually puts the year of Muttakkil-Assur at the year 706 B.C.

The campaigns of the unwearied Sargon did not end with the subjugation of the whole region of Babylonia. The Annals and Fasti narrate how he overthrew Mutallu of Kummukh (Gumathene), who had united himself with Argistis, king of Ararat, who must have taken the place of Urza (p. 99), and that he planted there people from Bit Yakin (707 B.C.). The land of Ellip, which he had previously subjugated, remained faithful to him as long as king Dalta lived. After his death his sons Nibi and Ispabara contended for the throne. The former sought help from Sutruk Nanchundi of Elam; Ispabara vowed allegiance to him (Sargon). To support Ispabara, Sargon sent troops to the land of Ellip, the position of which we can only so far ascertain from the inscriptions, as to know that it bordered on Media (p. 101) as well as Elam. Nibi's warriors and the Elamites were defeated; Nibi was taken prisoner, his adherents were crucified, and Ispabara became the prince of the whole land (706 B.C.).<sup>236</sup>

Sargon, who defeated the Egyptians and the Ethiopians, who subjugated Syria and Babylonia, who had gone through so many battles, came to a violent end, but not in war. He was murdered. The list of the rulers announces the naked fact in the year 705 B.C., and adds the accession of his son Sennacherib, on whom fell the heavy task of maintaining the wide dominion which Sargon had won. If he did not succeed in doing this without some loss, his buildings, which he began immediately after his accession, were not inferior to those of his father. He must have commenced them at the beginning of his reign. The inscription on a cylinder (Bellino), bearing the date of the third year of Sennacherib, gives the dimensions of a palace of Sennacherib at Nineveh, and describes the architecture and adornment. The kings, his fathers, had built this palace, but had not completed its splendour; the waves of the Tigris had injured the foundations; he altered the course of the Tigris, strengthened the dams, built the palace afresh, and caused lions and bulls to be hewn out of great stones.<sup>237</sup> The remains of this structure lie on the site of the ancient Nineveh, immediately to the north of the Khosr, which flowed through the city, on the old bed of the Tigris, near the modern village of Kuyundshik. The dimensions give this palace the first place among the castles of the kings of Asshur. It rose on a terrace of more than 80 feet in height, close by the Tigris. The great porticoes were from 150 to 180 feet in length, and about 40 feet in breadth; the great gallery was 218 feet in length, and 25 feet in breadth. About 70 chambers have been discovered in this building.<sup>238</sup> The main front lay to the north-west; two great winged bulls with human heads guarded the entrance. At the entrance of the north-east front also were two bulls of this kind. In the great portico behind this entrance, and the gallery abutting upon it, the process of building is represented on the reliefs on the walls. We see the clay pits, the workmen carrying baskets filled with clay and bricks, the great blocks intended for the images of the lions and bulls coming up the Tigris, and brought to the elevation on shore by ropes drawn by hundreds of hands. This is done by means of slips under which are placed wooden rollers. A lion, already finished, standing upright and surrounded by a wooden case, and held up by workmen with ropes and forked poles, is drawn along in this manner; the hinder end of the slip is then raised by a lever placed on wedges in order to facilitate the elevation. The overseer stands between the fore-feet of the colossus, and directs by the movement of his hands the efforts of the workmen. Sennacherib himself from his chariot watches the advance of this statue. In the same way a finished

---

<sup>235</sup> Ménant, "Babylone," p. 157.

<sup>236</sup> The Annals in Oppert, *loc. cit.* 7, 51-53. The Fasti in Ménant, "Annal." p. 186, 187.

<sup>237</sup> Cylinder Bellino in Ménant, "Annal." p. 229.

<sup>238</sup> G. Rawlinson, "Monarch," 22. 179, n. 5.

human-headed bull is drawn along by four long rows of workmen. In another chamber we see rows of servants, who carry apples and grapes, pastry and other food in baskets. The reliefs of the next porticoes and halls exhibit the warlike acts of Sennacherib; the crossing of rivers, sieges, stormings of cities in the mountain country, in the plain, in the marsh. Unfortunately the inscriptions over these have almost entirely perished along with the upper part of the walls; only a few words are legible. The inscription of the third year of Sennacherib (703 B.C.) concludes the account of this building with the words: "To him among my sons, whom Asshur in the course of the days shall summon to be lord over land and people, I say this: This palace will grow old and fall to pieces. May he set it up, restore the inscriptions and the writing of my name, and clean the images; may he offer sacrifice, and put everything in its place; so shall Asshur hear his prayer."<sup>239</sup> The inscriptions on slabs between the thighs of the two bulls before the north-west entrance give a detailed account of the dimensions and manner of the building of this palace.<sup>240</sup>

In the inscription on the cylinder, Sennacherib boasts that he made a canal from the Khosr through the city; that he renovated Nineveh, "the city of Istar," and made it brilliant as the sun; the prisoners, Chaldæans, Aramæans, captives from Van and Cilicia, were employed on these works.<sup>241</sup> The adornment of Nineveh, the strengthening of its walls, are mentioned on inscriptions on slabs in the palace itself.<sup>242</sup> Another cylinder (Smith) from the ninth year of the reign of Sennacherib (697 B.C.),<sup>243</sup> also mentions the buildings which the king undertook for the restoration of Nineveh: the prisoners of his campaigns worked at them: Philistines and Tyrians are here added to Chaldæans, Aramæans, Armenians, and Cilicians.<sup>244</sup> Later documents inform us that Sennacherib built temples to Nebo and Merodach at Nineveh.<sup>245</sup> A third cylinder (Taylor) has been preserved from the fifteenth year of the reign of Sennacherib (691 B.C.), which tells us of a second great building of his at Nineveh. By the kings, his fathers, a house had been erected for the preservation of the treasure; for the horses and troops. This building had become damaged; he caused the old house to be removed, and built up again on a larger scale.<sup>246</sup> The remains of this building lie to the south of the confluence of the Khosr and Tigris near the modern Nebbi Yunus. According to the evidence of the ruins it was of smaller dimensions than the palace at Kuyundshik. To the north-east of Nineveh, near the modern Bavian, the image of Sennacherib is hewn in the rocks. The inscription on this image informs us in detail what Sennacherib had done for the irrigation of the land of Assyria: among other things it is mentioned, that he had made 16 (18) canals from the Khosr, or into it.<sup>247</sup> Bricks found at Sherif-Khan show by the stamp that Sennacherib built a temple there to Nergal; the bricks of a heap of ruins to the south-west of the ancient Arbela show that he erected there the fortifications of a city called Kakzi.<sup>248</sup>

The most indispensable task which devolved on Sennacherib at his accession was the keeping of Babylon in subjection. The news of the death of Sargon, the mighty warrior, might arouse among all the nations which had felt the weight of his arms so heavily the hope of again shaking off the yoke. If the Babylonians succeeded in freeing themselves from the dominion of his successor, there was the prospect that such a success would be an event of wide importance; a sign and example to the subject lands. According to the evidence of Josephus, Berosus related of Sennacherib that he fought against

<sup>239</sup> Ménant, *loc. cit.* 229, 230.

<sup>240</sup> Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 212.

<sup>241</sup> Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 228, 229.

<sup>242</sup> Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 211.

<sup>243</sup> Year of Nabudurussur.

<sup>244</sup> G. Smith, "Disc." p. 308.

<sup>245</sup> G. Smith, "Assurbanipal," p. 318.

<sup>246</sup> Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 224.

<sup>247</sup> Rodwell, "Records of the Past," 9, 23; Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 235.

<sup>248</sup> In Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 237.

all Asia and Egypt:<sup>249</sup> Abydenus represented him as subjugating Babylonia.<sup>250</sup> Alexander Polyhistor, according to a fragment which Eusebius has preserved, narrated as follows: "After that the brother of Sennacherib reigned in Babylon, and after him Akises, who was slain by Merodach Baladan after 30 days; Merodach Baladan maintained himself by violence for six months, and was then slain by a man of the name of Elibus. But in the third year of the reign of Elibus, Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, collected an army against the Babylonians, conquered them in the battle, and carried away Elibus with his followers to Assyria. Sennacherib placed his son Asordanes (Esarhaddon) as ruler over Babylon; he himself returned to Assyria."<sup>251</sup> After the reign of Arkeanus (Sargon) from 709 B.C. to 705 B.C., the astronomical canon gives an interregnum for the years 704 and 703 B.C.; after this comes the reign of Belibus, which lasted three years, from 702 B.C. to 700 B.C. Belibus was succeeded by Aparanadius, who reigned six years (699-694 B.C.). If we attempt to unite these statements with the quotation from Polyhistor, Sennacherib, immediately on his accession, made his brother king and viceroy of Babylon, but he was unable to maintain his position; a rebel, Akises, seized the throne, and was in his turn overthrown by Merodach Baladan, whose reign over Babylon only lasted six months. The two years after Sargon's death, which were occupied by this regency and these usurpations, are marked in the astronomical canon as an interregnum. As the last half year of this period was occupied with the usurpation of Merodach Baladan, and the preceding month by Akises, Sennacherib's brother must have reigned over Babylon 17 months after Sargon's death, or a little longer (the canon gives the last year of each reign entirely to the king who died in it). Towards the close of these two years the Elibus of Polyhistor, the Belibus of the canon, overthrew Merodach Baladan, and reigned till 700 B.C., in which year Sennacherib marched against Babylonia, defeated Elibus, took him prisoner, and placed his son Asordanes as king over Babylon. The Aparanadius of the canon must be the Asordanes of Polyhistor.

Sennacherib's inscriptions show that the events took place nearly but not quite in this manner. His archives say nothing of the regency of a brother in Babylon; they do not exclude such a regency, but they show clearly that Merodach Baladan was in possession of the throne of Babylon in 704 B.C. Is this Merodach Baladan the Merodach Baladan of Bit Yakin, of South Chaldæa, who paid homage to Tiglath Pileser II. at Sapiya in the year 731 B.C., and who after the death of Shalmaneser IV., in the year 721 B.C., possessed himself of the throne of Babylon – whom Sargon fought against at that time, but did not overthrow – whom he deprived of all his land in the years 710 and 709 B.C., and then received into favour? The man who possessed himself of Babylon in the year 704 B.C. belongs without a doubt to the princely house of Bit Yakin; we find him retiring before Sennacherib from Babylon to Bit Yakin, as he had previously retired before Sargon. The Merodach Baladan of Sennacherib can therefore only be the Merodach Baladan of Tiglath Pileser, and Sargon, or a son of the same name.<sup>252</sup> As the inscriptions give the name simply without any addition, we have in him no doubt the same prince of Bit Yakin who submitted to Tiglath Pileser and was defeated by Sargon. That Merodach Baladan was in possession of Babylon at least six months, as Polyhistor states, is proved by the combinations into which, according to Sennacherib's inscriptions, he entered with the king of Elam, the tribes of Mesopotamia, and tribes of the Arabians, before Sennacherib attacked him; by the fact that Sennacherib found the troops of Elam united with those of Babylon; and by the embassy of Merodach to Hezekiah, king of Judah, urging him to make common cause with him against Assyria, which is mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures. He certainly had time to make extensive preparations against Sennacherib.

---

<sup>249</sup> Joseph. "Antiq." 10, 1, 4.

<sup>250</sup> In Euseb. "Chron." 1, p. 35, ed. Schöne.

<sup>251</sup> Euseb. "Chron." 1, p. 27, ed. Schöne.

<sup>252</sup> Cf. E. Schrader, "K. A. T." s. 213 ff.

Merodach Baladan must therefore have obtained the throne of Babylon not long after the accession of Sennacherib. Sennacherib's first campaign was directed against him in order to restore the authority of Assyria over Babylonia. The inscription of Nebbi Yunus tells us at the very beginning: "In a great battle I conquered Merodach Baladan and the nations of Chaldæa and Aram; the army of Elam which had come to their assistance."<sup>253</sup> Four other narratives in greater detail have been preserved relating to this campaign; one from the third year of Sennacherib (703 B.C., the cylinder Bellino, already mentioned), the second from the ninth year of Sennacherib (697 B.C., the cylinder Smith, also already mentioned), the third dates from the fifteenth year of Sennacherib (691 B.C., the cylinder Taylor), the fourth is given in the inscription on a slab between the thighs of the bulls at the entrance to the great palace of Sennacherib at Kuyundshik. This last account, which is uninjured, does not go back beyond the fourth year of Sennacherib. The oldest account tells us: "At the beginning of my reign I inflicted a defeat on Merodach Baladan, the king of Kardunias (Babylon), together with the army of Elam, before the city of Kis. In the middle of the battle he escaped alone, and fled to the land of Guzuman, into the marshes. The chariots, horses, mules, and camels, which he left on the field of battle, fell into my hands. His palace in Babylon I entered full of joy. I opened his treasury; I carried away gold, silver, golden and silver vessels, precious stones; his wife, and the women of the palace. I sent my soldiers to pursue him to Guzuman, to the marshes. They pursued him five days, but no trace of him was seen. In the strength of Asshur, my lord, I took 89 fortified cities and fortresses in the land of Kaldi, and 820 smaller places. The Aramæans and Chaldæans, who formed garrisons in Erech, Nipur, Kis, Chalanne, and Kutha, I carried away with the rebellious inhabitants; Belibus, the son of a man of wisdom, from the neighbourhood of Suanna, I made the ruler of Sumir and Accad."<sup>254</sup> The two accounts immediately following the first agree with it except that the number of the fortified places taken in Chaldæa is given as 75 and 76, and the number of smaller places in both is 420. Both also, like the summary account on the slabs of the bulls, pass over the setting up of Belibus as regent,<sup>255</sup> no doubt because this regency was no longer in existence when they were written. In Polyhistor, as we have seen, it is Elibus who overthrows Merodach Baladan; in the astronomical canon, Belibus ascends the throne of Babylon in the year 702 B.C. According to the inscriptions, Merodach Baladan's rule over Babylon was overthrown as early as 703 B.C.; according to the canon, his overthrow, or at any rate the establishment of Belibus, did not take place till 702 B.C.

After driving Merodach Baladan out of Babylonia Sennacherib subjugated the tribes of Tumun, Richih, Rahua, Pekod, Hauran, Nabatu, and Hagaranu (the Hagarites), who "had not been reduced to submission," *i. e.* who had taken up arms against Assyria for Merodach Baladan; 208,000 men and women, children and adults,<sup>256</sup> were captured and carried away to Assyria, with 7200 horses and mules, 5330 camels, 70,000 oxen, and 800,600 head of small cattle.<sup>257</sup> The amount of cattle taken is omitted in the second, third, and fourth accounts; the second and third give us the number of the prisoners. These prisoners (Chaldæans and Aramæans), Sennacherib, as we saw above, employed in building his new palace and his buildings at Nineveh. After this Sennacherib turned against Ispabara, king of Ellip, whom Sargon had assisted to the throne against his brother (p. 105). Ispabara escaped, the land was laid waste, 34 places were taken, the chief city Ilinzas received a new name, Kar Sennacherib. "At my return," so we find it stated with complete agreement in all the four narratives, "I received the great tribute of the distant land of Media, and subjugated that land to my dominion."<sup>258</sup>

---

<sup>253</sup> In Ménant, "Annal." p. 231.

<sup>254</sup> E. Schrader, "K. A. T." s. 219 ff.

<sup>255</sup> G. Smith, "Disc." p. 298; Cylinder Taylor in Ménant, "Annal." p. 215.

<sup>256</sup> G. Smith's Cylinder, "Disc." p. 298; Ménant reads 2800 prisoners on the Cylinder Taylor.

<sup>257</sup> Cylinder Bellino.

<sup>258</sup> Cylinder Bellino, in Ménant, p. 228; Cylinder G. Smith, "Disc." p. 302; Cylinder Taylor in Ménant, p. 227; "Records of the Past," 7, 61.

Merodach Baladan had been compelled to retire from Babylonia. He had maintained himself in his native land in south Chaldæa. When in Syria, Sidon and Ascalon, Ekron and Judah took up arms, and Sennacherib was compelled to march thither, Merodach Baladan could attempt to regain what he had lost. He was soon again in alliance with the king of Elam, or rather he remained in alliance with him. The Elamites reconquered two cities which Sargon had taken from them. In Babylonia a rebellion broke out, at the head of which stood a man of the name of Suzub. Belibus appears to have been unable to maintain himself against him, against South Chaldæa under Merodach Baladan, and Elam. The astronomical canon puts the end of his reign in 700 B.C. The later inscriptions of Sennacherib, as already observed, make no mention of Belibus, but they tell us of a campaign which Sennacherib on his return from the Syrian war, in which at the close, as we shall soon see, he gained no success, undertook against Suzub and South Chaldæa. "In my fourth campaign," so Sennacherib relates on the cylinders Smith and Taylor, "I collected my army: I bade it go against the land of Bit Yakin. In the course of this enterprize I brought about the overthrow of Suzub the Chaldæan, who dwelt in the marshes; he retired. Merodach Baladan, whom I had thrown to the ground on my former campaign, whose war-like forces I had scattered, retired from the approach of my mighty warriors, and the blow of my violent attack; he put the gods, who rule in his land, on board ship, and fled like a bird to Nagitirakki, which lies in the midst of the sea. His brothers, the scions of the house of his father, whom he left behind on the coast, and the remainder of his nation in the lakes and marshes I brought out and took prisoners. I turned back and destroyed his cities. I struck terror into his ally, the king of Elam. At my return I put Assurnadin, my eldest son, on the throne of his dominion, and entrusted him with the whole extent of the land of Sumir and Accad." The stone slabs on the bulls of Kuyundshik also mention the establishment of Assurnadin in Babylon.<sup>259</sup>

From this account we gather that Babylon, if it was not lost, wavered; that the chief of the rebels in Babylonia retired before the approach of Sennacherib into the marshes. The establishment of Assurnadin as regent of Babylonia by Sennacherib did not take place till Merodach Baladan was driven out of Bit Yakin. The inscriptions do not mention Sennacherib's entrance into Babylon. Aparanadius, whose reign the astronomical canon represents as beginning with the year 699 B.C., can only be Assurnadin, the son of Sennacherib.<sup>260</sup>

The expulsion of Merodach Baladan out of South Chaldæa; the establishment of the successor to the throne of Assyria as regent of Babylon, had no more lasting results than the establishment of Belibus three years before. Suzub, who had retired into the marshes before Sennacherib, was again at the head of Babylonia. "The tribes of Bit Yakin," so Sennacherib tells us on the cylinder Taylor, "despised my rule; they settled in the city of Nagitti, in the land of Elam." Sennacherib directed his sixth campaign against them (the fifth was directed against the land of Nipur). "On my sixth campaign (696 B.C.), I attacked Elam, and carried the people of Bit Yakin with the people of Elam into captivity. At my return, Suzub, a child of Babylonia, whom the rebellious people in the land of Sumir and Accad had raised up, came to offer me battle. I conquered him; he fell into my hand; I gave him his life, and caused him to be taken into Assyria. The king of Elam, who came to his assistance, I put to flight."<sup>261</sup> The inscription of Nebbi Yunus gives us a fuller account. It narrates the carrying away of the people of Elam, like the cylinder, and then continues: "After this (?) the leading inhabitants of Babylonia, who were round Merodach Baladan, escaped and called on the king of Elam for help, who placed Suzub, the son of Gated, on the throne. I sent my warriors against the king of Elam; they slew many of his people; they made themselves masters of the gods who dwell in Arak (Erech), of Samas, Bilit, Istar, Nergal, and their endless treasures. Suzub, the king of Babylon, who was taken

---

<sup>259</sup> G. Smith, "Disc." p. 308; Ménant, "Annal." p. 219, "Records of the Past," 7, 63.

<sup>260</sup> The fourth campaign of Sennacherib, the establishment of Assurnadin cannot be later than the year 698 B.C., since the Cylinder Smith, which dates from the year 697 B.C., concludes with these events, and then speaks only of the buildings; G. Smith, "Disc." p. 308.

<sup>261</sup> In Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 220, 221.

prisoner after a great battle, they brought to Nineveh into my presence."<sup>262</sup> We see that in spite of the regency of Assurnadin, which would not be weak, in spite of the attack of Sennacherib on Elam, the adherents of Suzub, when combined with the adherents of Merodach Baladan and supported by Elam, were strong enough to remove Assurnadin not long after his appointment, and to raise Suzub to the throne. His defeat and imprisonment were heavy blows for the Babylonians, but they did not break their resistance. The city of Babylon was not attacked by Sennacherib.

The stubborn resistance of Babylonia against Sennacherib was supported, as the inscriptions clearly show, by Elam, where a new king, Kudur Nanchundi, had succeeded Sutruk Nanchundi (p. 103).<sup>263</sup> In order, no doubt, to isolate the Babylonians and take from them this support of their resistance, Sennacherib directed his seventh campaign against Elam: "The king of Elam," we are told in the inscription of Nebbi Yunus, "had been the ally of the people of Babel."<sup>264</sup> The two cities which Sargon had taken from Sutruk Nanchundi,<sup>265</sup> which the Elamites had subsequently reconquered, were taken by Sennacherib, who besides enumerates 34 large cities of Elam, which he had besieged, conquered, and burnt. Kudur Nanchundi abandoned his chief city, Madaktu, and escaped into a distant region. Sennacherib intended to besiege Madaktu, but snow and rain detained him in the mountains; he returned to Nineveh.<sup>266</sup>

Sennacherib had not attained his object, the subjugation of Elam. What Sennacherib announces as the result of his campaign must have appeared to the Babylonians as very small, if not altogether a failure. In the cylinder Taylor a new struggle against Babylon follows the return of Sennacherib to Nineveh, a struggle more important and severe than any preceding. Suzub, whom Sennacherib had taken captive in 696 B.C., escaped out of imprisonment, and again appeared as king at the head of Babylonia. Merodach Baladan is no more, but his son unites with Suzub; all Chaldæa rises; and by its side the Elamites, Aramæans, and several tribes of Arabia. This great rebellion ends with the capture and destruction of Babylon. The date of these events, which took place in the eighth campaign of Sennacherib, can only be defined by the fact that they belong to the period after the year 696 B.C., and before the year 692 B.C. The cylinder which narrates them bears the date of the beginning of the year of Belsimiani, i. e. of the year 691 B.C. The events of the eighth campaign are connected, and follow immediately on each other; the close was the conquest of Babylon and second capture of Suzub, as the introductory words to this campaign on the cylinder prove: "In my eighth campaign the dominion of Suzub came to an end." After the conquest of Babel, this inscription only mentions the erection of the building at Nebbi Yunus (p. 108). We must, therefore, put the beginning of the new struggle in the year 695 B.C., the destruction of Babylon in the year 694 B.C.

The Babylonians – so our inscription continues after the return of Sennacherib from Elam – had closed the great gates of their city; Suzub, who had escaped out of captivity to Elam, and had returned from thence to Babylon, was placed on the throne of Sumir and Accad. He opened the treasure of Bit Saggatu, i. e. of the great temple of Merodach (I. 295), and sent the sacred gold and silver to the king of Elam. Kudur Nanchundi died three months after the campaign of Sennacherib against Elam; he was succeeded by his brother, Umman Minanu, who was ready to give assistance. Nabu-labar-iskun, a son of Merodach Baladan, joined Suzub; the Chaldæan regions of Bit Adin, Bit Amukan, Bit Sahalla, took his side. The Parsua, the land of Ellip, finally the tribes of the Pekod, Gambul, Rahua, and Chindar, rebelled and marched to Babel to Suzub, "whom they called king of Babylon."<sup>267</sup> "The king of Elam, the lands of Parsua and Ellip, the whole of Chaldæa, all the tribes of

---

<sup>262</sup> In Ménant, p. 232.

<sup>263</sup> An inscription of this king found at Susa is explained by Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 82.

<sup>264</sup> In Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 232.

<sup>265</sup> Above, p. 114; Annals of Sargon, in Oppert, "Records of the Past," 7, 45.

<sup>266</sup> Cylinder Taylor in Ménant, p. 222.

<sup>267</sup> Cylinder Taylor in Ménant, p. 232, 233; Talbot, "Records of the Past," 1, 78.

Aram, were united with the king of Babylon."<sup>268</sup> On the banks of the Tigris, near the city of Chaluli, they offered battle to Sennacherib, 150,000 strong. Sennacherib conquered; Nabu-labar-iskun was captured; Umman Minanu and Suzub escaped. "I granted their lives to those who submitted, and acknowledged my dominion." With these words the account of the eighth campaign of Sennacherib closes on the cylinder Taylor. After the description of the battle of Chaluli the inscription of Bavian continues: "The whole land of Elam I struck with terror; the warriors fled before me to the highest mountains. A second time I turned against Babylon; I won the city; I spared not the men, the children, or the slaves. Suzub, the king of Babylon, who fell into my hands, I carried away and his kindred. The gods of the city of Hekali, Bin and Sala, which Marduk-nadin-akh, king of Accad, had taken from Tiglath Pilezar and carried to Babylon 418 years previously, I took away from Babylon; I put them up again in their place in the city of Hekali. The cities and their palaces I have destroyed from the foundation to the summit; the walls, altar, temples, and towers, I have laid waste."<sup>269</sup>

The statements of the astronomical canon do not agree with these inscriptions. With the canon, this period, distracted by contests in which for the most part Suzub is at the head of Babylon and the city of Babel is not in the power of Sennacherib, was the reign of Aparanadius, or, as we supposed, of Assurnadin, which in the canon lasts from 699 to 694 B.C. The year 693 is given to Regebelus, who is succeeded by Mesesimordakus from the year 692 to 688 B.C. After this the canon places an interregnum of eight years (688-680 B.C.). If we are to attempt to harmonise the two, Regebelus and Mesesimordakus may be regarded as viceroys, to whom, after the capture of Babylonia, Sennacherib entrusted the rule of the country in those years. The interregnum which follows would then be explained by the fact that Sennacherib reigned over Babylonia without a viceroy from the year 688 B.C. But in none of the inscriptions preserved does Sennacherib name himself in his title, king of Sumir and Accad, or king of Babel. The astronomical canon gave us the name of Sargon at the time when he ruled directly over Babylon; why is not Sennacherib's name mentioned in a similar position? It is not impossible that new rebellions followed the capture of Babylon, in which Regebelus and Mesesimordakus were leaders; but it is certain that Babylonia, if not South Chaldæa, was under the dominion of Assyria at the death of Sennacherib.

---

<sup>268</sup> Inscription of Nebbi Yunus in Ménant, *loc. cit.* p. 232. An inscription of Exarhaddon repeats the events of this war: Suzub, "of unknown race, a lower chieftain," came to Babylon, and was raised to be king; Umman Minanu was gained by the treasures of Bit Saggatu; the Parsua joined, etc.; G. Smith, "Disc." p. 315.

<sup>269</sup> Rodwell, "Records of the Past," 9, 27, 28; Ménant, "Babylone," p. 166. Vol. II. p. 40.

## CHAPTER VI. SENNACHERIB IN SYRIA

When Babylonia rebelled against Sennacherib, immediately after the murder of Sargon; when Merodach Baladan, whom Sargon had deprived of the rule over Babylon, and had finally suffered to remain in South Chaldæa, succeeded in again making himself master of Babylon; when the Aramæans, the tribes of Arabia, Elam, and the land of Ellip had taken up arms against Sennacherib – the regions of Syria also thought of shaking off the yoke of Assyria. The cities of the Phenicians and of the Philistines, the kingdom of Judah, over which king Hezekiah had ruled since the death of Ahaz (728 B.C.), rebelled. The old opponent of Assyria in the East, Merodach Baladan, sought support in the West; the West put hope in the successes of the East: Babylonia and Syria entered into combination.

The Hebrew Scriptures tell us: "Merodach Baladan, the son of Baladan, king of Babel, sent a letter and present to king Hezekiah. And Hezekiah listened to him, and shewed them all his treasure-house, the silver and the gold, the spices, and the precious oil, and all the house of his armour, and all that was found in his treasures: there was nothing that he did not show them in his house, and in his dominion."<sup>270</sup> The request of Merodach Baladan to make common cause with him, which reached Hezekiah in the year 704 B.C.,<sup>271</sup> did not find Judah unprepared. Since Ahaz had purchased the safety of his kingdom before the combined forces of Damascus and Israel, by submission to the dominion of Assyria, Judah had been at peace. In nearly thirty years of peace, which had elapsed since that time, the kingdom had been able to recover her position. The long siege of Samaria, the fall of the kingdom of Israel, were seen by Hezekiah without any movement. But the thought of shaking off one day the yoke of Assyria was not new to him. Sargon has already told us, that at the time when Ashdod rebelled under Yaman (711 B.C.), the Philistines, Edom, Moab and Judah, did indeed pay their tribute, but they thought of treachery, and had sent presents to the king of Egypt (at that time Shabataka, p. 91). Hezekiah had provided armour, weapons and shields in abundance; he could now no doubt show a well-furnished armour-house to the envoys of Merodach Baladan.<sup>272</sup> The neighbours of Judah, the cities of the Philistines, and Sidon among the Phenicians, were prepared to make common cause with Hezekiah. In the deepest secrecy he formed connections with Tirhaka the successor of Shabataka in Egypt and Meroe, and sent him valuable presents.<sup>273</sup> Beside Babylonia, Hezekiah could reckon on Egypt; it was much to the interest of Egypt to nourish the resistance of Syria against Assyria, and to support the Syrians against Sennacherib as soon as they took up arms.

Isaiah most earnestly warned the king and the people of Judah against such a rash enterprise – how could any one hope to withstand the crushing power of the Assyrians? "Woe to the rebellious children," is the cry of the prophet to the king and his counsellors, "that take counsel without Jehovah, and make covenants, not in Jehovah's spirit, that they may add sin to sin; who go down to Egypt and enquire not at the mouth of Jehovah, to protect themselves with the protection of Pharaoh, and trust in the shadow of Egypt! The protection of Pharaoh shall be your shame, and the trust in Egypt your confusion. They will carry their riches on the backs of asses, and their treasures upon the bunches of camels to a people that shall not profit them. Egypt's help is vain and void. I call Egypt a tempest,

---

<sup>270</sup> 2 Kings xx. 12.

<sup>271</sup> Merodach Baladan was, as has been shown (p. 113), driven out of Babylon in the year 703 B.C.; it is certain that he was ruler there in 704 B.C. If the Books of the Kings do not mention his embassy to Hezekiah till after the siege of Jerusalem by the Assyrians, they show by the announcement of Isaiah to Hezekiah, which they put after the embassy of Merodach Baladan thus: "He will be saved out of the hand of the Assyrians" (2, xx. 6), that the embassy was at Jerusalem before the campaign of Sennacherib; cf. Isa. xxxix.

<sup>272</sup> Isa. xxii. 2; 2 Chron. xxxii. 4, 5.

<sup>273</sup> Isa. xxx. 2, 3, 6.

which sits still. Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, and stay on horses and on chariots because they are many, but look not unto Jehovah! The Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses are flesh, and not spirit. The protector stumbles, and the protected falls to earth.<sup>274</sup> But ye are a rebellious people, lying children, and will not hear the command of Jehovah. Ye say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us true things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceit.<sup>275</sup> Beware that your bands be not made stronger.<sup>276</sup> Say not, The overflowing scourge shall not come to us, for we have made lies our refuge, and under deceit we have hid ourselves.<sup>277</sup> The overflowing scourge shall tread you down. The Lord Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel said, In repentance and rest ye shall be saved; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength. But ye said, No; for we will flee upon horses, we will ride upon the swift.<sup>278</sup> Because ye trust in oppression and perverseness your iniquity shall be as a watercourse breaking out against a high wall, whose breaking cometh in an instant.<sup>279</sup> I have heard from Jehovah God of hosts, of a consumption, even determined upon the whole earth."<sup>280</sup>

"Add ye year to year, let the feasts go round, for I will distress Jerusalem, saith Jehovah, and encamp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and raise forts against thee.<sup>281</sup> The enemy is come to Aiath, he is passed to Migron; at Michmash he hath laid up his carriages. They are gone over the passage; they have taken up their lodging at Geba; Ramah is afraid; Gibeah of Saul is fled. Lift up thy voice, O daughter of Gallim; cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth! Madmenah is removed, and Gebim's inhabitants flee. This day they shall remain in Nob; then he shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem.<sup>282</sup> What aileth thee now that thou art wholly gone up to the house-tops, thou that art full of stirs, a tumultuous city, a joyous city? Elam bears the quiver, with chariots of men and horsemen, and Kir uncovers the shield. Thy choicest valleys are full of chariots, and the horsemen shall set themselves in array against the gate. The walls are broken down, and there is a sound of crying to the mountains."<sup>283</sup>

We saw how Sennacherib succeeded in forcing Merodach Baladan from Babylon into South Chaldæa, in defeating the Aramæans, in driving back the Elamites, and subjugating the land of Ellip (704 and 703 B.C.). After the rebellion in the East was crushed, he turned, in the year 701 B.C., to Syria, to bring again into obedience the rebellious cities and states.<sup>284</sup> In the inscription on the bulls, and on the cylinders Smith and Taylor,<sup>285</sup> Sennacherib tells us: "In my third campaign I marched against the land of the Chatti (the Syrians). Luli (Elulæus), the king of Sidon, was seized with a mighty terror of my rule, and fled from the West land (*acharri*) to Cyprus (Yatnan), in the sea. I reduced his land to subjection. Great Sidon, and Little Sidon, Beth Zitti, Zarephath, Machallib, Achzib, Akko, his fortified cities, the might of my warriors and the terror of Asshur overpowered

<sup>274</sup> Isa. xxxi. 1-3.

<sup>275</sup> Isa. xxx. 9, 10.

<sup>276</sup> Isa. xxviii. 12.

<sup>277</sup> Isa. xxviii. 15. The deceit is no doubt to be explained by the secrecy of the negotiations with Egypt.

<sup>278</sup> Isa. xxx. 15, 16.

<sup>279</sup> Isa. xxx. 12, 13.

<sup>280</sup> Isa. xxviii. 22.

<sup>281</sup> Isa. xxix. 1.

<sup>282</sup> Isa. x. 28-32.

<sup>283</sup> Isa. xxi. 1, 2, 5-7.

<sup>284</sup> It is the third warlike enterprise of Sennacherib, which for the following reasons cannot be placed earlier than 702 B.C. The cylinder Bellino dates from the seventh month of the third year of Sennacherib, *i. e.* from the year 703 / 702; it concludes with the subjugation of Ellip and the tribute of the Medes. Sennacherib, therefore, may have first marched to Syria in the year 701 B.C. The inscription of the bulls narrates this campaign, which extends to the establishment of Assurnadin in Babylon; so the cylinder Smith, which dates from the year 697 B.C. Hence, as the year of Hezekiah's accession is fixed for the year 728 B.C. (p. 16, *n.*), the siege of Jerusalem does not fall in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, in which the Books of Kings place it, but in the twenty-eighth year.

<sup>285</sup> I combine these three accounts, which differ but little from each other.

them. They submitted to me. Tubal (Ithobal) I placed upon the royal throne over them, and the payment of yearly tribute to my kingdom I imposed upon them as a continuous tax. Menahem of Samaria (the second of this name, p. 87), Tubal of Sidon, Abdilit of Aradus, Urumelek of Byblus, Mitinti of Ashdod, Kamosnadab of Moab, Malikram of Edom – all the kings of the West land, brought their costly presents and things of price to me, and kissed my feet. But Zidka of Ascalon, who had not bowed to my yoke, the gods of the house of his fathers, the treasures, his wife, his sons, his daughters I brought to Assyria. Sarludari, the son of Rukibti, their former king, I placed over the people of Ascalon. I imposed upon him the payment of tribute, as the symbol of subjection to my rule, and he rendered obedience. In continuing my campaign I marched against the cities of Zidka, Beth Dagon, Yappa (Joppa), Bene Barak, Azor (Yasur), which had not submitted to my service, I besieged them. I took them and led away their prisoners. The chiefs and the nation of Ekron, who had put Padi their king, who remained true and faithful to Assyria,<sup>286</sup> into iron bonds, and had handed him over to Hezekiah (Chazakiyahu) of Judah, my enemy. Their heart was afraid, for the evil deed which they had done. In the neighbourhood of Eltekeh (Altaku), the battle was drawn out against me; they encouraged their warriors to the contest. In the service of Asshur I fought against them and overpowered them. The charioteers and sons of the king of Egypt, together with the charioteers of the king of Meroe, my hand took prisoners in the midst of the fight. Eltekeh and Timnath (Taamna) I attacked, I took, I carried their prisoners away. I marched against the city of Ekron. The priests,<sup>287</sup> the chiefs, who had caused the rebellion, I put to death; I set their bodies on stakes on the outer wall of the city (the inscription of the bulls says: 'I smote them with the sword'). The inhabitants of the city who had exercised oppression and violence, I set apart to be carried away; to the rest of the inhabitants who had not been guilty of faithlessness and rebellion I proclaimed forgiveness. I brought it about that Padi their king could leave Jerusalem, installed him on his throne of dominion over them, and laid upon him the tribute of my rule. Hezekiah of Judah who did not submit – 46 of his fortified cities, and innumerable fortresses and small places in his kingdom I besieged and took. Two hundred thousand one hundred and fifty captives, male and female, horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep without number, I took out from them, and declared to be booty of war. Hezekiah himself I shut up like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem (Ursalimma), his royal city. I threw up fortifications and towers against the city; I broke through the exit of the great gate. His cities which I laid waste I separated from his land, and gave them to Mitinti the king of Ashdod, and Padi the king of Ekron, and Ismibil the king of Gaza, and thus I diminished his land. He (Hezekiah) was overcome with fear before my power, and the Urbi (?) and the brave warriors whom he had brought up to Jerusalem for defence inclined to submission. He agreed to pay tribute.<sup>288</sup> Thirty talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, precious stones, chairs of ivory, skins and horns of Amsi, great treasures, his daughters, the servants of his palace, women and men, he sent to Nineveh, my royal abode, and his envoy to pay the tribute and promise submission."<sup>289</sup>

---

<sup>286</sup> Cylinder Smith, "Disc." p. 304.

<sup>287</sup> G. Smith, "Disc." p. 304.

<sup>288</sup> Inscription of the bulls in E. Schrader, "K. A. T." I. 31, s. 187.

<sup>289</sup> E. Schrader, "K. A. T." 171 ff. G. Smith, "Disc." p. 303 ff. Rodwell, "Records of the Past," 7, 61 ff.

## **Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.**

Текст предоставлен ООО «Литрес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на Литрес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.