cause it by the *nahak, i.e.* incantation,[1] over remains of food, or the skin of fruit, such as banana, which the person has eaten, on whom they wish to operate.' Dr. Turner himself informs us 'that the belief in the system of *nahak*-burning was as firm in the craft as out of it. If a disease-maker was ill himself, he felt sure that some one must be burning his *nahak*. He, too, must have a shell blown and presents sent to the party supposed to be causing the mischief.'[2] The sorcerer of Tanna is not an embryo god, he receives presents to induce him to influence the gods or to stop his own incantations, and though regarded as a 'sacred man' (? priest), is really the dupe of his own 'sympathetic magic.' A pretty embryo god! He is more likely to evolve into a scientific scavenger.

[1] Dr. Turner mistakenly identifies *nahak* with rubbish, principally refuse of food, the thing to be 'bewitched'—a mistake a newcomer, whether a traveller or missionary, is very apt to make.

[2] *Op cit.* p. 91.

Sennacherib's Second Expedition to the West, and the Date of his Siege of Jerusalem.

By Professor J. V. Prášek, Ph.D., Prague.

II.

The principal merit of having recognized correctly the internal character of the biblical record in question, of having critically distinguished its components, and drawn therefrom the logical conclusions, belongs to B. Stade, who (first in his *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* i. 617 ff., and afterwards in his well-known examination of the sources in the *Z.A.T.W.* 1886, p. 183 ff., which in the main is to be regarded as conclusive) recognizes three independent sources, which are partly represented also in Is 36–38, and from which the redactor of the Books of Kings has produced the present form of text.

One must not, indeed, forget Stade's predecessors, who laboured to prepare the rugged path of examination of the sources for the master. Sir H. Rawlinson, as was remarked before, had already shown indirectly that the biblical account (2 K 18^{13-16}) is to be distinguished from the rest of the narrative relating to Sennacherib's undertakings against Judah, a view which, however, comes to the same thing as the supposition that two distinct sources were afterwards worked up into a single narrative. He was followed by Kleinert (*S.K.* 1877, i. 167 ff.), who, however, sought to prove that 2 K 18^{14-16} refers not to the campaign of Sennacherib but to that of Sargon, the name Sennacherib being arbitrarily inserted by the compiler in v.[13], and the section having in view the time of the Assyrian invasion of Palestine, 713 B.C., on which occasion Ashdod in particular was subdued; cf. Schrader, *K.A.T.*[2] 310. A more correct view of the state of the case was taken by Wellhausen (in Bleek's *Einleit. in. d. A.T.*[4] 256), who expresses his conviction that in 2 K 18^{14-16} on the one hand, and in v.[17ff.] on the other, we have accounts of two different *stages* of the same campaign. Floigl (*Die Chronologie der Bibel*, 28 ff., and also in his *Cyrus und Herodot.* 169 ff.) regards the narrative of 2 K 18^{14-16} as the only authentic one, and the other, $18^{13.\ 17f.}$–20^{19}, as a legendary account put together from older material during the Exile, but considers that both narratives, although independently composed, relate to the same event, a view which is maintained also by Nowack (*S.K.* 1881, p. 300 ff.), who, following Kuenen, appeals in support of it to the circumstance that in 2 K 18^{14-16} we find uniformly the form חזקיה, whereas in the other passage in Kings as well as in Is 36–39 we have always חזקיהו.

None of the views cited could rise to the height of H. Rawlinson's explanation, because even that which is the condition of all advance, namely, the distinguishing of two original accounts in the Bible narrative, cannot arrive at the correct conception of the circumstances of the case without the only possible conclusion that the different *sources* have in view different *events*. Stade has the merit of being the first to place the investigation of Sennacherib's relations with the West of Palestine upon the footing it had already gained at the beginning of ancient Eastern monumental research, through

the labours of the ancient master of cuneiform lore. Already in his *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* i. 617 ff., notwithstanding that he still held to the essential unity of the events recorded in the Bible narrative, Stade points the right way to establishing the state of the case in question, when, in accordance with the laws of methodical criticism of the sources, he examines the narrative as to its origin and analyses it. He points out first of all that the passage, 2 K 18^{13}–20^{19}, speaks, indeed, of the exploits of Sennacherib, but says nothing about his conflicts with Hezekiah's allies in Palestine, and that what is recorded in 18^{13}–19^{37} about Sennacherib's relations with Hezekiah belongs, with the exception of $18^{14\text{-}16}$, to the prophetic legend, and is on the same footing as the story of Hezekiah's sickness and recovery in 2 K 20. The contents of $18^{17\text{-}19}$ are separated by at least a century from the occurrences in view, and show themselves by their character to be unhistorical. Stade urges, further, that even the section 2 K 18^{17}–19^{37} is not a single narrative, but is made up of two legends which contradict one another in points of detail, although they deal with the same occurrences. The suture of the two accounts may be seen in 19^{9b}. Moreover, the second legend has had introduced into it in $19^{21\text{-}31}$ an oracle of the prophet Isaiah which did not originally belong to it, and which interrupts a speech of Isaiah it contained. This oracle presupposes, like the first legend, 18^{17}–19^{9a}, that the message of Sennacherib was delivered by word of mouth.

From the above results Stade has not drawn the conclusion, but remarks (p. 619) that it is impossible, by combining the annals of Sennacherib with the contents of 2 K 18–20, to reconstruct the history of the campaign of 701. Stade sees now that what is related in 2 K $18^{14\text{-}16}$ agrees completely with what Sennacherib himself records, but holds that the legends of 2 K 18–20 are wrong in asserting that matters did not go the length of an attack upon Jerusalem, and that Sennacherib's officers appeared before the city only as bearers of a message. Upon the whole, these legends are without accurate information, but they still present to us a correct view of certain events dating from that period of danger to Jerusalem. This last remark applies particularly, Stade thinks, to the cause assigned by the legend for the final deliverance of Jerusalem.

From the standpoint of biblical study and Egyptology Stade's conclusions are justified, still holding, as he does, to the contemporaneousness of Šabak, whom he identifies with the סוא מלך־מצרים of 2 K 17^4, and being thus able to place the year of Tirhaḳa's accession in Egypt before the fourteenth year of Hezekiah (= 701 B.C.). In this way, as we shall see presently, the greatest difficulty in the way of harmonizing the Bible narrative with the record of Sennacherib may be removed. But criticism arrives at a different result when it goes thoroughly into the Assyrian records and the results of the latest chronological researches regarding the twenty-fifth Egyptian dynasty of the Ethiopians. Stade's conclusions, then, must be rejected, but his great merit, that of having analysed the present biblical narrative into its original sources, remains unaffected.

It was reserved for H. Winckler to indicate the path, which, following Stade's distinction of sources, leads to the only possible solution of the complicated question. In his *Altorient. Untersuchungen* (1889), Winckler paved the way for successful study of the question, when, as the result of thoroughgoing chronological researches he correctly determined the date of the twenty-fifth Egyptian dynasty. Since, according to his results, Tirhaḳa did not ascend the throne of Egypt till 691 B.C., the סוא of 2 K 17^4 cannot possibly be regarded as king of Egypt,—a conclusion which confirms the view strenuously maintained by Winckler that in the Books of Kings we must distinguish sharply between Miṣraim-Egypt and Miṣraim-Muṣri in N.W. Arabia, and that the סוא in question is not the king of Egypt but one of the Arabian princes of Muṣri, of whom many make their appearance on the plane of history at the time of the Sargonides. Winckler did not himself draw this inference in 1889, but placed סוא among a number of Delta princes subject to the Pharaoh,—a view which we encounter again three years later in his *Gesch. Bab. u. Assyr.* p. 234. But in regard to the criticism of the events of 701, Winckler (*l.c.* p. 254) already gives utterance to the conviction that, in opposition to the usual view, only the passage, 2 K $18^{14\text{-}16}$ and $17^{13.\ 17}$–19^{8}, deals with the events of the year 701. '2 K $19^{8\text{-}37}$, which is generally referred to the same events,' he goes on to say, '*can be understood only of a new expedition of Sennacherib, which took place in the period that followed the destruction of Babylon* (689), *but of which we hear nothing from Sennacherib himself.*'

Still more precisely does Winckler formulate this opinion in *Alttest. Untersuchungen*, p. 31, where, after a detailed comparison of the Assyrian record with the Bible passage, 2 K 18^{14-16} and $17^{18.\ 17}$–19^{8}, he arrives at the conclusion that in the narratives relating to the year 701 there is no mention at all of *a siege of Jerusalem*, and gathers from the terms of Sennacherib's record, that the king was not then in a position to besiege Jerusalem. According to Winckler's conviction, Sennacherib did not proceed on that occasion to the actual siege designed for a future occasion, for, as his own words unmistakably show, he withdrew without Hezekiah having made submission. On the other hand, Winckler (p. 35) regards the passage, 19^{3-37} (of course only in the *historical* kernel that has first to be determined by criticism), as part of a narrative according to which Sennacherib, in the course of an expedition, in which Palestine also was threatened without its being actually said that he came there, was compelled, when Tirhaḳa of Egypt moved against him, by the outbreak of pestilence to beat a hasty retreat, and was shortly thereafter murdered at Nineveh. Winckler (p. 36) goes on to maintain that the campaign of 19^{8-37} cannot thus have taken place until after 691, and, in fact, only some years after that date, since Tirhaḳa cannot have been in a position in the very first year after his subjugation of Egypt to undertake such far-reaching movements, which involved him in a conflict with Assyria. The same result is made use of by Winckler in his *Gesch. Israels in Einzeldarstellungen* i. 184, where he emphasizes the circumstance that Tirhaḳa succeeded in inciting Hezekiah to repeated revolts from Assyria. Arabia may also have taken part in the revolt, and Sennacherib may have begun operations against Arabia and Egypt, in the course of which Judah, although it was not actually traversed by the Assyrian army, was yet already threatened, when he was murdered in Assyria by his son. Winckler sketches the operations of Sennacherib in the West in the same way most recently in his article 'Das alte Westasien' in Helmolt's *Weltgeschichte*, iii. 72.

It might have been expected that recent historical descriptions would show the impress of the above views of Stade and Winckler. As a matter of fact, Krall (*Grundriss der altor. Gesch.* i. 153, 156) has utilized the results of both these scholars, comparing, as he does, the Assyrian statements regarding the third campaign of Sennacherib with the biblical narrative of 2 K 18^{13-16}, but he supposes a second campaign towards the close of Sennacherib's reign against the Hatti-land, which was really directed against Egypt, or, in a sense, Tirhaḳa, king of Ethiopia. This expedition is passed over in silence by the Assyrian sources, but must be assumed on the ground of Is $36^{2ff.}$. The siege and wonderful deliverance of Jerusalem belong, according to Krall, to this second campaign. Guthe (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.* 204) treats the matter in the same way, likewise assuming a second expedition of Sennacherib to the West, in support of which he utilizes certain statements of Esarhaddon, and places this campaign in the last eight years of Sennacherib.

All the more remarkable is it that so reputable a scholar as Professor Meinhold of Bonn, in his lecture, 'Jesaja und seine Zeit' (11 f.), argues strenuously in favour of a single campaign of Sennacherib to the West. He asserts, quite correctly indeed, that, at the latest, by 693 'the statesmanlike *young* Tirhaḳa' had seized the government of Egypt, but this does not exclude his having before that date taken the lead in Egypt, and his having descried the approach of danger from Assyria and sought to ward it off. Accordingly, his ambassadors may have been seen in Jerusalem (as early, say, as 703). A strange backward inference! In the year 693 Tirhaḳa is represented as coming upon the scene in Egypt as a young ruler, and yet ten years earlier the important rôle is assigned him of sending embassies and entertaining political relations with neighbouring states, and this actually in the name of a king not related to him—for here there can be question only of the Σεβιχώς of Manetho, but Tirhaḳa was the relative of Šabak, whose exact relation to Σεβιχώς is unknown, but of any relation of the latter to Tirhaḳa we find not a single trace. When Meinhold finds in the mention of Tirhaḳa in the biblical narrative a confirmation of his theory, he sets the pyramid on its apex, since he ignores the results of thorough criticism of the sources.

I have found it necessary to discuss the views of my predecessors before proceeding to my own solution of the problem. My justification for acting thus must be found in the importance of the question for the history of the ancient East, and of the Israelites in particular.

(*To be continued.*)