

it is quite a false canon of criticism to lay down that the same word must be used in the same sense throughout the whole of any passage. See for instance the uses of *καθεύδειν* in 1 Thes. v 6–10.

For the thought compare the words of St Teresa : ‘This resignation to His will is so efficacious that I desire neither life nor death, except for some moments when I long to see God ; and then the presence of the Three Persons becomes so distinct as to relieve the pain of absence, and I wish to live—if such be His good pleasure—to serve Him still longer. And if I might help, by my prayers, to make but one soul love Him more and praise Him, and that only for a short time, I think that of more importance than to dwell in glory’ (*Life of S. Teresa of Jesus*, translation by Lewis, p. 479).

E. F. BROWN.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

I. ‘THE JEWS’ LANGUAGE’: 2 KINGS XVIII 26 = ISA. XXXVI 11.

DR G. A. SMITH, in dealing with the Biblical narrative of Sennacherib’s invasion of Judah (2 Kings xviii 13, 17–xix 37 = Isa. xxxvi, xxxvii), happens to refer to ‘the possibly late features which the language of the two accounts exhibits’ (*Jerusalem* ii p. 165), and adds the footnote ‘For example, the name *Jewish* (instead of Hebrew) for the language of the people of Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii 26, 28), not elsewhere used in the O. T. except in the post-exilic Neh. xiii 24, and objected to on the ground that it could not have come into use so soon after the fall of Samaria and the sole survival of Judah at the end of the eighth or beginning of the seventh century’. As such an inference from the use of the term יְהוּדִים in this narrative struck me as somewhat surprising, I have been at some pains to investigate the opinions of the more recent commentators on Kings and Isaiah upon this point, and I find that the view that the use of this expression is a mark of late date appears to be generally held.

Thus Dr Benzinger remarks, ‘The fact that the narrator calls Hebrew “Jewish” proves that he is writing at any rate long after the fall of Israel’. Dr Kittel, after stating with good reason that the fact that a high Assyrian official knew Hebrew need cause us no surprise, goes on to say that ‘it is more remarkable that, instead of “Hebrew”, the term employed is “Jewish”, an expression which naturally could first have arisen (only) some time after the fall of “Israel”; cf. Neh. xiii 24’: Dr Duhm, in his commentary on Isaiah, expresses himself still more

definitely : 'The fact that the narrator calls Hebrew "Jewish" is an indication that he lived long after the fall of Israel, and probably at a time when Hebrew to some extent pure was spoken only by the Jews who had returned from exile, but no longer by their nearest neighbours, e.g. the Ashdodites (*Neh.* xiii 24).' Similar observations are made by Dr Marti (on *Isaiah*), and by Dr Stade (*Kings* p. 273 in *S.B.O.T.*); while the use of the term as probably a mark of post-exilic date is noticed by Dr Cheyne (*Introd. to Isa.* p. 228), and Dr Whitehouse (*Comm. on Isa.* i p. 350). Dr Skinner, in his commentaries on *Isaiah* and *Kings*, makes the non-committal statement that 'Hebrew is so called only in one other (post-exilic) passage, *Neh.* xiii 24', and leaves his readers to draw their own inference. Doubtless further expressions of the same opinion might have been collected, had it been worth while to do so.

Such a unanimous verdict is perhaps sufficient to carry conviction to most minds ; yet the fact should not be overlooked that, before it can be accepted, two preliminary questions have to be answered : (1) whether the Israelites in pre-exilic times were accustomed to call their language 'Hebrew', and (2) whether the Assyrian Rabshakeh would have understood them if they had so called it.

(1) After reading the expressions of opinion as given above, the uninitiated might reasonably infer (or, indeed, could hardly do otherwise than infer) that, while the term 'Jewish' as applied to the language of Judah could only be paralleled by the single post-exilic passage, *Neh.* xiii 24, the term 'Hebrew' so applied was a regular if not a frequent appellation in pre-exilic times. As a matter of fact 'Hebrew' is never used to describe the language of Judah or Israel anywhere throughout the whole Old Testament.¹ The only descriptive expression is 'the language (lip) of Canaan' in *Isa.* xix 18 (largely regarded as post-exilic), a phrase which, in view of the fact that the language of the surrounding nations, so far as known to us (Canaanite or Amorite glosses in T. A. inscriptions, Moabitic, Phoenician), was essentially similar to the language of Israel, must be recognized as fairly accurate and comprehensive. That Judaeans or N. Israelites in pre-exilic times were accustomed to speak of their language as 'Canaanic' need not, however, be seriously considered. As to the use of the term 'יְהוּדִי',

¹ So far as I am aware, the earliest use of the term 'Hebrew' to describe the language of Israel occurs in the Prologue to *Eccl.* (cir. B.C. 130) where the writer remarks οὐ γάρ ἵστηναμεῑ αὐτῷ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Ἐβραιοῖ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῇ εἰς ἔτερας γλώσσαν. The verb 'Ἐβραιέω' to speak Hebrew' is found in Josephus, *B.J.* VI ii 1. 'Ἐβραιοί' occurs in N.T. in *St John* v 2, xix 13, 17, 20; *Rev.* ix 11, xvi 16; 'Ἐβραιοί φωνή in 4 *Macc.* xii 7, xvi 15. The later Jewish term was נָבָרֶךְ, 'the holy tongue'.

'Hebrew', applied to the people of Israel, the fact has repeatedly been remarked that this appellation is only employed to distinguish Israel from foreigners, or as put into the mouth of foreigners. Evidence is distinctly against the view that the Israelites or Judaeans ever so called themselves *among themselves*, and therefore is opposed with equal force to the supposition that they were accustomed to speak of their language as 'Hebrew'. And moreover, since the Israelites were aware that their language was also the native language of non-Hebrew peoples, e.g. the Canaanites and Amorites, the term 'Hebrew' would have been as inappropriate from an ethnic as from a national point of view, being from the former point of view too narrow, and from the latter too wide.

(2) The view that **עִבְרֵי**, 'Hebrew', means 'one from the other side', i.e. from beyond the Euphrates (**עַבְרָה**), or, it may be, from beyond Jordan, from the point of view of the country west of Jordan, may be said at the present time to hold the field, in spite of Dr Sayce's rival explanation from *ibira* which occurs on a Babylonian lexical tablet as the equivalent of *damqarum*, 'a commercial traveller' (*Expos. Times*, 1907, p. 233). If, then, 'Hebrew' was employed by the surrounding races with any consciousness of its meaning, its use is only comprehensible from the point of view of the races west of the Euphrates or west of Jordan, and the term would have no meaning to the Assyrians living east of the Euphrates. As a matter of fact there is no evidence that Assyrians or Babylonians ever applied the term 'Hebrew' to the nations of the west or to their language. The term which is used by Sargon to describe the language is *līšān* (*mât*) MAR. TU (KI) (i.e. *Amurri*), 'tongue of the West land'. He speaks of building 'a vestibule (? *bit appâti*) like a palace of the land *Hatti*,¹ which in the tongue of the West land is called *bit hilâni*' (or *hilanni*: **בֵּית חִילָנִי**: cf. *Jer. xxii 14*).² 'Tongue of the West land' is, however, an expression somewhat wide in scope; and since the regular term used by Assyrian kings for the land of Judah is (*mât*) *Ia-u-du* (*Ia-u-di*), and the gentilic form (applied e.g. by Sennacherib to Hezekiah) (*mât*) *Ia-u-da-â* (i.e. **יְהוּדִי**, 'Judaean' as in the old Annalistic passage 2 Kings xvi 6) it is surely no unfair inference that they would have described the language of the land as *līšān* (*mât*) *Ia-u-di*, 'tongue of Judah'. We may give Eliakim and his brother officials the credit of knowing that the Rabshakeh was not accustomed to describe them as 'Hebrew' but as

¹ 'The Hittite land' is here used in its widest application among the Assyrians to denote the region bordering on the Mediterranean, including Phoenicia and the land of Israel: cf. Delitzsch *Paradies* pp. 271 ff.

² *Annals* 423; XIV 73; *Pr.* 161; *Pp.* ii 29, iv 106, v 39. Cf. Winckler *Sargon* pp. 72, 92, 130, 140, 154, 162; *K.B.* p. 76.

'Judean'; and therefore it is not unreasonable to infer that, in addressing him, they would speak of their language as 'the Judean language'. This conclusion is the more acceptable since no evidence can be advanced as to what they might otherwise have called it. Of course the fact that נַבְרָא happens only to occur once besides in a post-exilic passage is no argument against such a pre-exilic usage.

II. THE INTERPRETATION OF ISA. XX 6.

The historical accuracy of Isa. xx is perhaps as well authenticated as that of any of the Biblical narratives connected with the life of Isaiah. The annals of Sargon enable us to form a fairly clear idea of the movements of this king in the direction of Palestine, and the circumstances by which they were guided. Incidentally we are able to make a reasonable conjecture as to how far, during the years immediately subsequent to the fall of Samaria in 721 b.c., the complexion of foreign affairs may have altered the dominant policy of the kingdom of Judah, favouring at one time Isaiah's policy of loyalty to Assyria, at another the schemes of the political party which desired to cast off the vexatious yoke of this suzerain, and in conjunction with the neighbouring small states of the west to form an alliance with Egypt upon equal terms.

In 720 b.c. a rebellion against Assyria in the west called for a campaign. Yaubi'di of Hamath (also called Ilubi'di), whom Sargon describes as 'a rash wicked man who had no right to the throne', appears to have seized the occasion of the preoccupation of the new king of Assyria with affairs in the east to assume the reins of government in Hamath and raise the standard of revolt. He carried with him several of the neighbouring states: Arpad, Simirra, and even Damascus and Samaria are mentioned as joining in the rebellion. Further south, and no doubt as part of the same movement, Hanunu, king of Gaza, having entered into alliance with Egypt, thought himself strong enough to rebel against the authority of Assyria.

Sargon besieged Yaubi'di in the city of Karkar, captured and burnt the stronghold, flayed the rebellious king alive, and executed all the ring-leaders among the rebels. He then turned his arms towards Philistia, and advanced against the united forces of Hanunu and the Egyptians.

Sargon's account of the campaign which ensued is as follows:—
 'Hanunu, king of Gaza, together with Sib'u *turtan* [commander-in-chief] of the land of Egypt, advanced to make war and battle against me at Raphiah. I inflicted a crushing defeat upon him; Sib'u feared the clash of my weapons and fled, and his place was not found. Hanunu the king of Gaza I took prisoner.'¹ Another account² states that

¹ *Pr.* 25, 26: cf. Winckler *Sargon* p. 100.

² *Annals* 30, 31: cf. Winckler *Sargon* p. 6.

Hanunu was carried captive to Assyria, the city of Raphiaḥ burnt, and 9,033 prisoners taken. Thus the first of the attempts made by a Palestinian state at rebellion against Assyria in reliance upon the support of Egypt ended in disaster. Such an event must have furnished an effective set-back to the policy of the Egyptian party in Jerusalem, and strengthened, for the time being, the political influence of the prophet Isaiah.

The following six years (719-714 B.C.) were devoted by Sargon to campaigns in various directions, chiefly against the powerful kingdom of Urartu in the north, i.e. the Ararat of Gen. viii 4, the modern Armenia. In 714 B.C. the Assyrian king completed the subjugation of Urartu, and the following two years were fully occupied in small wars nearer home. Meanwhile affairs in the west were again on the brink of disturbance. Sargon's long absence had doubtless led to the growth in power of the politicians who favoured an alliance with Egypt as against Assyria, in Philistia as well as in Judah. At length, in 711 B.C. the flame of rebellion broke out, with Ashdod as its centre. Azuri king of Ashdod had been deposed by Sargon's orders for failure to pay tribute, and Ahimiti his twin brother appointed king in his stead. Under the leadership of a man who is described as *Yatna*, with the various reading *Yamani*, 'who had no right to the throne', Ahimiti was deposed and slain, and Philistia, Edom, Moab, and Judah withheld their tribute and sent presents instead to Pharaoh king of Egypt.

Sargon immediately dispatched his *turtan* to Philistia, no assistance for the rebellious states was forthcoming from Egypt, and the Assyrian commander captured Ashdod, Gath, and Ashdudimmu, and stamped out the rebellion. *Yamani* found safety in flight to Egypt, leaving behind him his wife, sons, and daughters.¹ Probably Judah, Edom, and Moab escaped reprisals through timely submission and dispatch of the tribute which they had withheld. Sargon describes himself in one passage as 'subjecter of the land of Judah of which the situation is remote'.² Possibly he is referring to this occasion, and never actually instituted warlike operations against Hezekiah.

It is this campaign against Ashdod which is mentioned in Isa. xx. In spite of Isaiah's warnings against the folly of breaking with Assyria and putting trust in Egypt, the policy of his opponents had triumphed, and the result had nearly brought disaster upon Jerusalem. For three years Isaiah put off his outer garment of sackcloth and walked barefoot about Jerusalem in captive garb, as a living illustration of the captivity which was destined to fall upon the Egyptians and upon all such as

¹ *Annals* 215-228: Winckler *Sargon* pp. 36-38; *Pr.* 90 ff; *ib.* pp. 114-116; XIV 11 f; *ib.* 82.

² *Nimrud-inscr.* 8: Winckler *Sargon* 168.

placed reliance upon their help against Assyria. The chapter concludes with the oracle, ‘And Yahwe said, Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked and barefoot, for three years a sign and a portent against Egypt and against Cush ; so shall the king of Assyria lead away the captives of Egypt and the exiles of Cush, young and old, naked and barefoot, and with buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt. And they shall be dismayed and ashamed because of Cush their expectation and because of Egypt their glory. And the inhabitant of this **נָחָת** shall say in that day, Behold, such is our expectation whither we fled for help, to be delivered from the king of Assyria ; and we, how shall we escape ?’

The purpose of this note is to make a suggestion as to the reference of **נָחָת נָחָת** in the last verse of Isa. xx. This expression, rendered in R.V. ‘the inhabitant of this coastland’, is explained, I believe, by all recent scholars as referring to the smaller states of the Palestinian coastland, especially Judah, Philistia, Moab, and Edom. The explanation which I here put forward I believed at first to be entirely new, until, on referring to Dr Cheyne’s *Commentary* (1886), I found that it had long ago been made by Chwolson (*Jüd. Zeitschr.* 1872, p. 306); though why it has fallen out of notice it is difficult to conjecture, since Assyrian evidence seems to prove conclusively that it is correct.

As is well known, the regular reference of **נָחָת**, **נָחָת** in the Old Testament is to the islands and coastlands which lay, from the Israelite point of view, across the western sea. Apart from our passage, exception to this usage is found only in Isa. xxiii 2, 6, where the term is applied to Tyre ; but even this is scarcely an exception, since it is probable that it is the *island* of Tyre which the writer has in mind. Thus the application of the term to the coastland of Palestine, inclusive of Judah where Isaiah himself is situated, is at least very unusual if not unparalleled, and requires substantiation.

Turning to Sargon’s account of the campaign, it will be recollected that the fomenter of the rebellion, who seems to have placed himself upon the throne of Ashdod, is called *Yatna* (*var. lect. Yamani*). Modern commentators (Drs Dillmann, Duhm, Skinner, Marti, Wade) appear to regard this as a proper name ; but since *Yatnana* clearly denotes Cyprus, there can be little doubt that *Yatna* (*Ya-at-na-na-á?*) is the corresponding gentilic form, and denotes a *Cypriote*. As for the variant *Yamani*, it simply describes the same man by another gentilic, ‘Ionian’, which from the Assyrian as from the Israelite point of view may very well be applied to an inhabitant of Cyprus.¹ *Yamani* =

¹ The interpretation of *Yatna*, *Yamani* here given is recognized by Winckler *Sargon* p. xxx note 2, and by Rogers *Hist. of Bab. and Assyria* p. 169 note. Cf. also Cheyne *E.B.* article ‘*Javan*’. Winckler later on altered his opinion, and

Yavani, i. e. the Heb. יְבָנִי *Yēvāni* (Joel iv 6)¹ gentilic of יָבָן *Yāvān* which corresponds to the Greek Ἰά̄σσων, a term which primarily refers to the Greek settlements in Asia Minor, but from the Semitic point of view has a wider denotation, and can certainly cover such a colony settled in Cyprus. In Gen. x 4 Kittim (i.e. the Kitians, inhabitants of Kiti in Cyprus) is included among the 'sons' of Yāvān.

Further evidence that Sargon came into conflict with the Cypriotes is afforded by a statement in a list of his achievements that he 'subdued seven kings of Yatnana which is situated seven days' journey into the midst of the western sea'. Indeed, he repeatedly refers to Yatnana as forming the western limit of his conquests.² It is also interesting to notice that he tells us that he 'caught the Ionians (*Ya-am-na-â*), who are in the midst of the western sea, like fish'.³

If, then, it was a Cypriote who was leader of the revolt against Sargon at Ashdod, and if the conquests of Sargon were actually extended to Cyprus, what can be more plausible than the supposition that Cyprus may have taken an important part (perhaps the leading part) in organizing the revolt, and that תְּהִלָּתָה שֵׁבֶת in Isa. xx 6 is to be rendered (as Chwolson rendered it) 'the inhabitant(s) of yonder island', i. e. Cyprus? Another possible rendering of the Hebrew is 'this inhabitant of the island', i. e. the individual Cypriote who fomented the revolt. If this latter rendering be correct, it would seem that תְּהִלָּתָה is employed with some contempt, as it is in xxii 15, with reference to Shebna who in all probability was leader of the Egyptian party in Jerusalem, and whose fall was very likely due to the catastrophe which resulted from his policy upon the occasion with which we are dealing.

C. F. BURNAY.

supposed that *Yamani* in our passage denotes a man from Yemen in South Arabia (cf. *Musri*, *Meluhha*, *Ma'in* p. 26 note 1). This view, which is closely bound up with the theory of a North Arabian Musri, can scarcely be maintained in light of the evidence above cited.

¹ *Yamani* is in all probability the exact transcription of the man's actual Canaanite designation יָמָנִי, of which the proper Assyrian equivalent would be *Ya-am-na-â*. For the interchange of *m* and *v(w)* in Hebrew and Assyrian, cf. מַרְדֹּךְ *Mar-dech*=*Warab sanna*; מַרְדֹּךְ אֲמֵל מְרוֹדָךְ *Amel-Merodach*=*Amel-Marduk*.

² XIV 17; cf. 22; *Pr.* 16, 145, *Pp.* i 7, ii 4, iii 5, v 15, iv 43, 63.

³ XIV 15, *Pp.* iv 34 f.