OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

I

THE INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH I 18.

THE interpretation of this passage as a rhetorical question goes back, I believe, to Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*[4] pp. 423 f), and has obtained a considerable measure of acceptance among students. Most recently we find it adopted by Mr Box in his edition of Isaiah (1908), and by Dr Guthe in his translation of Isaiah in the new edition of Kautzsch's *Die Heilige Schrift des A. T.* (1909). Thus the former scholar renders

> 'Come now let us argue together, says Jahveh:
> If your sins be as scarlet
> shall they become white as snow?
> Be they red as crimson
> shall they become as wool?'

and remarks in a footnote that 'the language of promise and forgiveness (*though your sins be as scarlet, they shall become*, &c.) is quite out of keeping with the stern logic of a legal plea. The most natural rendering of the Hebrew is that given above'.

The purpose of this note is to raise a question which seems not to have been duly considered, viz. whether such a rendering can be justified from the standpoint of Hebrew scholarship.

So far as I am aware, no clear case occurs throughout the Old Testament in which a question is to be assumed as implied by the speaker's tone (without use of an interrogative particle) in the apodosis of a conditional or concessive sentence.

In view of this statement, three passages appear to call for examination, viz. Judg. xi 9; 1 Sam. xx 9; 1 Sam. xxiv 20. The first of these, Judg. xi 9, is rendered by R. V.: 'If ye bring me home again to fight with the children of Ammon, and the Lord deliver them before me, shall I be your head?' (אנכי אהיה לכם לראש). This instance, however, clearly stands upon a different footing from Isa. i 18; and I have no hesitation in saying that the query of R. V. should be omitted. Jephthah is stating the terms of his compact with the elders of Gilead, in order that there may be no misunderstanding:—If I undertake this

task, and am successful, 'it is I who am to be your head' (as promised in *v.* 6).[1]

In 1 Sam. xx 9 Jonathan protests to David חלילה לך כי אם ידע אדע כי כלתה הרעה מעם אבי לבוא עליך ולא אתה אגיד לך; R. V. 'Far be it from thee: for if I should at all know that evil were determined by my father to come upon thee, then would not I tell it thee?' This rendering is adopted by many scholars (e. g. Driver, Kittel, Nowack, Dhorme); but the difficulty of the passage is admitted by all,[2] and, if the text is correct, there is a probability in favour of the explanation of Wellhausen, which assumes an aposiopesis:—'If, &c., and I do not tell thee *that*—' (sc. 'so and so may God do to me!'), i. e. in accordance with Hebrew usage, 'If, &c., I will certainly tell thee *that*!'

1 Sam. xxiv 20 (19 R.V.): וכי ימצא איש את איבו ושלחו בדרך טובה ויהוה ישלמך טובה תחת היום הזה אשר עשיתה לי, R. V. 'For if a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away? Wherefore the Lord reward thee good for that thou hast done unto me this day.' ושלחו ונ׳ is thus explained by Driver, Kittel, Nowack, Dhorme, Gesenius-Kautzsch § 150 *a*. That the whole passage presents difficulty is, however, recognized by scholars; and personally I think that Saul's words gain in force if we regard ושלחו ונ׳ as a continuation of the protasis וכי ימצא ונ׳, followed by an aposiopesis. Saul, in fact, is so overcome with amazement and gratitude at David's generosity that he cannot find words to express his feelings. All that he can do is to pray that Yahwe may reward his benefactor:—'And when a man finds his enemy, and sends him off on a good way—well! may Yahwe reward thee, &c.' This view of the passage is regarded with some favour by H. P. Smith, who thinks that the speaker intended to add 'Yahwe will reward him' as apodosis, but changed the construction.[3] Smith's alternative is to emend וּמִי for וְכִי with Klostermann, and to strike out אִישׁ: 'And who finds his enemy, and sends him off . . . ?'[4]

[1] An exact parallel is furnished by the words of Marduk when he undertakes Ansar's commission to oppose Tiâmat:—

'If I, as your avenger,
Quell Tiâmat and preserve your lives,
Hold the assembly, declare my lot supreme!'

Creation Tablet ii ll. 134 ff.

[2] H. P. Smith seeks to explain לא in ולא אתה ונ׳ as equivalent to the Arabic *la* 'surely'. Budde emends הֲלֹא for לֹא.

[3] LXX actually reads *καὶ Κύριος ἀνταποτίσει αὐτῷ ἀγαθά*, but the fact that this is a later alteration seems to be indicated by the continuation, *καθὼς πεποίηκας σήμερον*.

[4] The analogy of the ordinary cases of implied question as a paradox (as next cited) suggests that, had such a question been intended here, בדרך טובה would have been emphasized (this being the point on which the paradox turns), and we should have read וּבְדֶרֶךְ טוֹבָה יִשְׁלָחֵהוּ.

It may be well to consider the ordinary cases in which the rhetorical question is assumed in a sentence which creates a paradox when taken in relation to a statement of fact immediately preceding. Such a sentence seems regularly to be connected with the preceding clause by the conjunction וְ, the antithesis with what precedes being by this simple device brought into bold relief. In such cases it is undoubtedly legitimate to translate into English in an interrogative form; but the sense would be equally well expressed, and would perhaps approximate more nearly to the *feeling* of the Hebrew speaker, if, instead of the rendering 'shall I . . . ?' 'shalt thou . . . ?' &c., we were to adopt such a rendering as 'I am to . . . !' 'thou art to . . . !' &c. Thus we may notice Jon. iv 11, 'Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured . . ., and *I* am not to have pity on Nineveh!' (ואני לא אחוס). Judg. xi 23, 'And now Yahwe the God of Israel hath dispossessed the Amorites from before his people Israel, and *thou* art to possess them!' (ואתה תירשנו). Judg. xiv 16, 'Behold, my father and my mother I have not told, and I am to tell *thee!*' (ולך אניד). 2 Sam. xi 11, 'The Ark and Israel and Judah are dwelling in booths, and my lord Joab and the servants of my lord are encamped on the open field, and *I* am to go into my house to eat and to drink and to lie with my wife!' (ואני אבוא אל ביתי וג׳). So also 2 Kings xix 11 || Isa. xxxvii 11, Jer. xxv 29, xlv 4, 5, xlix 12, Ezek. xx 31. In Exod. viii 26 the paradox lies in the contrast of two hypothetical suggestions:—'Lo, we are to sacrifice the abomination of Egypt before their eyes, and they will not stone us!' (הן נזבח את תועבת מצרים לעיניהם ולא יסקלנו). This might be presented as a hypothetical sentence ('Lo, if we sacrifice . . ., will they not stone us?'); but this is due to the fact that both clauses are potential, and is not the *form* into which the thought is thrown in Hebrew. Job ii 10 is similar.

Assuming, then, that I have not overlooked any instance to the contrary, it follows from this discussion that, apart from Isa. i 18, the construction of an implied question in the apodosis of a hypothetical sentence is non-existent in Biblical Hebrew, or at best very doubtful. The form in which such a question is usually implied as a paradox in relation to a preceding statement suggests that, if Isaiah had intended to put the rhetorical question, he would have expressed himself in some such form as הִנֵּה בַּשָּׁנִים חֲטָאֵיכֶם וְכַשֶּׁלֶג יַלְבִּינוּ, 'Lo, your sins are as scarlet, and shall they become white as snow?' As the passage actually stands, it is in form a concessive sentence exactly of the type of Isa. x 22, Deut. xxx 4, Jer. xv 1, Job xx 6, 7; cf. König *Syntax* § 394 *a*. These facts are entirely in favour of the familiar rendering of A.V., R.V.

We are told, however, that this rendering 'is quite out of keeping

with the stern logic of a legal plea'. The idea that we have to do with a legal plea, and indeed the whole conception of a judgement-scene between Yahwe and His people, appears to be bound up with the interpretation of the expression וְנִוָּכְחָה. So Dr Skinner, in his note on the rendering of A.V., R.V., 'let us reason together,' remarks, 'more accurately, *let us implead one another* (Acts xix 38, A.V.). The idea is that of a legal process in which each party maintains his own case (see ch. xliii 26).'

It is doubtful, I think, whether ונוכחה is intended to bear this signification. The verb, as ordinarily used in the Hiph'il, means, in the great majority of cases, *to shew to be wrong* or *confute*. In a limited number of cases (but still, enough to justify the usage) the meaning is *to shew to be right*. So Job xiii 15 אך דרכי אל פניו אוכיח, R.V. 'Nevertheless I will maintain my ways before him' (i.e. *justify them*); Job xix 5 ותוכיחו עלי חרפתי, R.V. 'And plead against me my reproach' (i.e. *shew it to be rightly deserved*). The use in Gen. xxiv 44 is similar, הוא האשה אשר הוכיח י׳ לבן אדני, R.V. 'Let the same be the woman whom the Lord hath appointed for my master's son.' Here the word means *hath shewn to be the right one*. So in *v.* 14. The verb is also used in a neutral sense, *to judge*, i.e. *to distinguish the right from the wrong*, or *vice versa*. So Isa. ii 4 (Mic. iv 3), Isa. xi 4 (in these cases parallel to שפט), Gen. xxxi 37, Job ix 33, &c. Hence the Niph'al, which might be reflexive or reciprocal, might conceivably mean *to shew one another to be wrong*, i.e. *implead one another* (cf. נִשָּׁפְטָה), or, *to shew oneself to be right*, or, *to right oneself in relation to some one else*. Our only decisive test is the examination of each occurrence in the light of its context. Now, besides Isa. i 18, only two occurrences of the Niph'al are found in the Hebrew Bible. The first is in Gen. xx 16, the passage in which Abimelech is explaining the steps which he has taken in order to make amends for the wrong which he has inadvertently done to Abraham and Sarah. Unfortunately the crucial words, addressed to Sarah, are very difficult in construction, and may be suspected of slight corruption. As the text stands, however, וְאֵת כֹּל וְנֹכָחַת is rendered by R.V. 'and in respect of all thou are righted'. Dr Gunkel's emendation has the merit of restoring a good construction, and at the same time not departing far from M.T. He would read וְאַתְּ כֻּלּוֹ נֹכַחַת, 'and thou art in all respects righted'. In any case, this sense for the Niph'al agrees well with the context.

The other occurrence is found in Job xxiii 2–7, a passage in which Job is stating that, if only he could come face to face with the Almighty, and have the opportunity of fairly pleading his case before Him, he would be certain of justification. In *v.* 7ª שָׁם יִשָּׁר נוֹכֵחַ עִמּוֹ is rendered by R.V. 'There the upright might reason with him', and by

Dr Driver, 'There an upright man would be disputing with him.' A point, however, which I would strongly urge, is that this clause does not merely repeat in different words what has already been elaborated in *vv.* 4–6, viz. the setting forth of the argument, but rather, like the parallel clause, *v.* 7ᵇ, the *issue of the argument*, viz. Job's acquittal. Thus I would render *v.* 7 :—

'There an upright man would be righted with him;
So should I be delivered for ever from my judge.'

If, then, this sense of the Niph'al can be maintained, we have strong grounds for rendering וְנִוָּכְחָה in Isa. i 18 'Let us right ourselves', i. e. in relation to one another, or, 'enter into right relations'. Such language, it is true, is scarcely consonant with the strict demands of human legal justice, when pushed to its extreme; but it can hardly be maintained that it is inconsonant with Yahwe's character if, in His graciousness, He still leaves room for repentance, and offers, like the father of the prodigal son, to meet the returning sinner half-way. Once we rid our minds of the idea of the judgement-scene in *vv.* 18–20, there is no reason why we should not connect these verses with the passage immediately preceding; and the opening words of *v.* 16, 'Wash you, make you clean', shew that the idea of the washing away of sins even so heinous as those of apostate Israel is prominent in the speaker's mind.

It may perhaps be replied that such a presentation of Yahwe's attitude is not in agreement with Isaiah's normal mode of thought, and his leading conception of the unique holiness of Yahwe. This I do not think. It is surely significant that nowhere do the awful holiness of Yahwe and the heinousness of His people's guilt (as seen in the prophet standing as Israel's representative, *v.* 5) come into bolder contrast than in the account of Isaiah's call in chap. vi; yet here the word used of the removal of sin (חַטָּאתְךָ תְכֻפָּר, 'thy sin is atoned') contains, without a doubt, the very idea of wiping away and making white or bright, which is prominent in chap. i 18.[1] For a later writer,

[1] Certainly the meaning of the verb כָּפַר is not 'to cover' but 'to wipe away'. This is clear from Babylonian. Cf. the story of Nerigal and Ereškigal, col. ii, line 20 *iṣbasima unaššaḳši dimtaša ikappar*, 'he caught her, and kisses her, and wipes away her tears'. In Brit. Mus. *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets* vol. xii plate 6 there is a Babylonian syllabary which gives the various equivalents of the sun-ideogram. Most of these have to do with the idea of *brightness*, e.g. *ellu*ᵐ 'bright', *namru*ᵐ 'bright', *namaru*ᵐ *ša ûmu* 'the brightness of day', *nûru*ᵐ *ša išâti* 'the light of fire', *ṣît* (*ilu*) *Šamši* 'sunrise', &c. There also occur *kaparu*ᵐ *ša kêni*, apparently 'the whitening *or* cleansing of wheat-flour', and *kuppuru*ᵐ *ša išaru*ᵐ 'the cleansing (brightening) of the righteous.' If such a sense is rightly to be inferred from the parallels, the root-notion of the verb *kapâru* seems to have been

too, who was the spiritual heir of Isaiah in the conception of the holiness of Yahwe, this attribute is brought into striking connexion with His disposition to invite to penitence and forgiveness, and not to cherish anger for ever :—'For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth : for the spirit would faint before me, and the souls which *I* have made' (Isa. lvii 15 ff.).

Upon these grounds I maintain that the familiar rendering of Isa. i 18 as a promise of forgiveness, rightly prized by many generations of English readers, is far more probably correct than its proposed substitute.

II

THE 'BOOT' OF ISAIAH IX 4.

Happening to refer recently to Prof. Kennett's article in *J.T.S.* vol. vii pp. 321 ff, entitled 'The Prophecy in Isaiah ix 1–7', it struck me that certain disputable statements contained there had been allowed to pass without challenge. The facts which I bring together in this note are familiar enough to students of Semitic philology ; but it seems worth while to mention them, if only to guard the ordinary reader against supposing that Semitic scholars are content to dismiss the authenticity of Isa. ix 1–7 upon the grounds cited by Prof. Kennett.

In the article in question Prof. Kennett seeks to prove that this prophecy belongs to the period of the Maccabees, and he lays considerable stress upon the expression of *v.* 4 (*v.* 5 E.V.) כָּל־סְאוֹן סֹאֵן בִּרְעָשׁ, which he is convinced must refer to 'the heavily nailed boots' of the Macedonian soldiery (pp. 331 f). In arguing that סאון cannot here refer to the boots of the Assyrians, he states, on hearsay, that 'the *sunu* of the Assyrians seems to have been something of the nature of a legging, or rather *puttee*, to protect the legs in marching through thorny places. But we cannot assign the sense of *legging* to the Hebrew word used in the passage before us (סְאוֹן), otherwise the adverb "noisily" or "heavily" (בִּרְעָשׁ) would be unexplained. The phrase seems to require *heavily nailed boots* ; but there is no proof that these, even if they existed, were the ordinary equipment of the Assyrians, who in the eighth century B.C.

that of *whitening* or *brightening*, ideas which are in other roots connected with *wiping* or *polishing*. The reference to the syllabary I owe to Mr C. J. Ball, who further notices that we have here the connexion of the noun כְּפֹר 'hoarfrost' (hitherto unidentified), doubtless 'the white *or* bright thing'.

The sense of wiping is found in the Syriac usage of the root, both in Pe'al and Pa'el.

are frequently represented as shod merely with a sort of sandal turned up at the heel, or even barefoot' (p. 327).

I am unable to find that *sûnu* denotes a *legging* or *puttee*. There is a *sûnu* which denotes the *loins* or *middle part of the body*. Another *sûnu* (the one in question) denotes a *tie* or *bandage*. It seems possible that the two words may have been originally one, and that the latter denotes, in the first place, a *bandage for the loins*. This, however, is uncertain. The *locus classicus* for this second *sûnu* is a Babylonian list given in v. R. 28, 5–11. Here the scribe gives seven equivalents of *sûnu*, viz. *mu-ug(k,ḳ)-ru*, *ri-ik-su*, *e-šu-u*, *e-nu-u*, *a-pa-ru*, *a-da-du*, *a-na-bu*. About the nature of the *bands* or *ties* denoted by these words not much can be affirmed. We know, however, that *riksu* can denote a *head-bandage* or possibly *turban*, since the phrase *rikis ḳaḳḳadi* occurs; and it is reasonable to connect *aparu* with the Heb. אֵפֹד which occurs in 1 Kings xx 38, denoting a *head-bandage* or bandage over the eyes.

But that these two words can only be used of head-bandages of course does not follow. The verb *apâru* is specially used of decking (binding) the head with a diadem (*agû*),[1] but *rakâsu* denotes binding or tying in a general sense. Muss-Arnolt explains *sûnu* in certain passages as 'a garment for the lower portion of the gods (statues)'. It cannot be maintained, in default of evidence, that *sûnu* could not be used of a puttee-legging, regarded as a leg-bandage; but the evidence for such a usage appears to be unknown both to Delitzsch and Muss-Arnolt.

Discussion of this matter is, however, quite immaterial to the present issue. What has to be remarked is that *sûnu* and סאון have no philological connexion whatsoever. The real Assyrian equivalent to סאון is the familiar *šênu*; and, strange to say, Prof. Kennett makes no allusion whatever to this latter word. Now with regard to *šênu* there is no room for the supposition that the word means a legging. It denotes a footgear of leather (usually with determinative prefix SU, i.e. *maškuˇ* = 'leather'), whether boot, shoe, or sandal. This, I take it, is proved by the common formula of salutation in the T. A. letters:—*a-na-ku ip-ru iš-tu šu-pa-li* (*maškuˇ*) *še-ni šarri be-li-ia*, 'I am the dust beneath the *sênu* of my lord the king.'[2] As to the form, Assyrian *ê* = Hebrew *ô* is seen also in *rêšu* = רֹאשׁ, *ṣênu* = צֹאן. The interchange Assyrian *š* = Hebrew שׂ is frequent, and שׂ and ס are commonly confused in Hebrew. Thus, e.g. we have *šâru* 'wind' = שָׂעַר, סַעַר.

[1] Possibly פְּאֵר 'turban', whence denom. פָּאַר 'deck with a turban', and then, generally, 'adorn', is connected with אפר, either as a transposition, or through internal triliteralization of the biliteral פר.

[2] Most common in the salutations of Abi-milki's letters: see Knudtzon no. 146 (Winckler 155), 147 (W. 149), 149 (W. 150), 151 (W. 151), 152 (—), 154 (W. 156), 155 (W. 152). Addu-dâni also uses the same formula, K. 295 (W. 240).

I do not, however, think that סָאוֹן stands for שָׁאוֹן. The fact needs carefully to be remarked that certain other words exist in Hebrew in which ס and not שׂ is the equivalent of Assyrian š, and that these all appear to be *loan-words* from the Assyrian or Babylonian. Thus סֵפֶר = *šipru* 'missive' is probably an ancient loan-word; and this may be affirmed with greater certainty of סָגָן = *šaknu* 'prefect', סוּגַר = *šigaru* 'cage' (Ezek. xix 9), and the proper name סַרְגוֹן = *Šargânu*. If סָאוֹן is also a loan-word from the Assyrian, the fact that this is the only occurrence of the word in the Hebrew Bible seems to favour the Isaianic authorship of the prophecy in which it occurs; since it is not improbable that the word was ordinarily unused in Hebrew, and that Isaiah intentionally used the native word applied by the Assyrians to their military boots.[1] I never read Isa. x 8 without thinking that Isaiah must have had some knowledge of the Assyrian language, and that, when he pictures the Assyrian king as saying הֲלֹא שָׂרַי יַחְדָּו מְלָכִים 'Are not my princes all of them kings?' he is playing on the fact that, while Heb. מֶלֶךְ = Assyr. *šarru*, Heb. שַׂר = Assyr. *maliku*; and, knowing that the Assyrians called their princes *malkê*, quotes this fact as an instance of overweening arrogancy.

That the Assyrian soldiers wore boots admits of no doubt. It is true that, as Prof. Kennett notices, they are sometimes represented barefoot; but many instances exist in which they appear to be wearing a high boot reaching half way up the calf of the leg. This may be seen in the relief which represents Sennacherib receiving tribute at Lachish, and more clearly still in sculptures in the Louvre of the period of Sennacherib and Assurbanipal.[2]

The precise meaning of Isaiah's phrase כָּל־סָאוֹן סֹאֵן בְּרַעַשׁ is not quite clear, as we do not know exactly what sense to attach to the denominative verb סֹאֵן. There exists in Assyrian a verb *šênu* (another point of connexion with Isa. ix 4); and the passages in which it occurs seem to demand the sense *to put on boots* or *sandals* (as in Syriac and Ethiopic). Upon this analogy, סֹאֵן should mean 'one wearing boots', and the whole phrase might be rendered, 'every boot of the booted warrior in the tumult'. The objection to this rendering is the sense which it assigns to רַעַשׁ; for it is doubtful whether the meaning

[1] Here I assume that the operation of the law which governed the interchange of vowels was constant, and that Isaiah, hearing *šênu* (or more probably *šên*) pronounced, would reproduce it, not indeed by סָאוֹן as pronounced by the Massoretes, but by its original form *sa'n*, which appears to have been the nearest Hebrew equivalent.

[2] I have not actually seen these latter sculptures; but I base my statement upon the excellent reproductions published under the title *Assyrian Sculptures*, by H. Kleinmann & Co., Plates XIV and XV.

'tumult' = 'tumultuous throng', though adopted by R.V., can be substantiated.[1] רַעַשׁ may mean 'earthquake'; 'trembling' (of a man, in fear, Ezek. xii 8; of a horse, in excitement, Job xxxix 24); 'noise'. The last meaning is the only one appropriate to our passage; and, if we adopt it, we must *conjecture* that the verb סאן can mean 'to march in boots', and is qualified by ברעש. We may then render, 'every boot of him that trampeth with noise'. Such a rendering, however, does not necessarily imply 'heavily nailed boots'. The thought is not of the tramp of a single soldier, but of the measured march of a well-disciplined army; and, nails or no nails, the boots of such an army would make a noise impressive to the hearer, and appropriately to be described as רעש.

Thus we conclude that the phrase under discussion, if not actually favourable to the Isaianic authorship of the section in which it occurs, is at any rate in no way opposed to it. Full criticism of the whole of Prof. Kennett's argument against the authenticity of the complete section would be too lengthy a matter for the present note; yet I cannot forbear making short reference to another argument which is based upon the linguistic characteristics of the passage. On p. 322 Prof. Kennett candidly admits that, 'if we argue only from the occurrence of words characteristic of Isaiah, a strong case can be made out for his authorship': and there follows a full list of such characteristic expressions. On pp. 326 f, however, we are told that, though the prophecy 'undoubtedly contains words which are characteristic of Isaiah, there are others which it is difficult to ascribe to him, or indeed to any one living in the golden age of Hebrew literature'. At this point a footnote comments upon 'the impersonal use of participles, as in מוּעָף or מוּצָק', which is rightly said to be 'most unusual in Hebrew'. Since these participial forms occur in *ch.* viii 23^a, which scholars as a whole regard as a late marginal comment, not on our section viii 23^b–ix 6, but on the preceding viii 22, Prof. Kennett cannot complain if I attach no weight to the bearing of this illustration upon the subject in question. In continuation, we read, 'Thus the phrase "Galilee (the district) of the nations" is one which cannot satisfactorily be accounted for on the supposition that it refers to Assyrian and other settlers after Tiglath Pileser's invasion in 734. There is no evidence, either from the Bible or from the monuments, that any colonists were introduced into Palestine before the fall of Samaria; and though the prophet *might*

[1] It might be supported by the analogy of הָמוֹן, which means both 'noise' and 'noisy multitude'; still, it is strange that, among the numerous occurrences of רַעַשׁ, no parallel can be cited for such a sense.

conceivably pass over the disaster which befell Samaria in 734, it cannot be supposed that he would have ignored the crushing blow which came upon it in 722.'

What value are we to attach to an argument which absolutely ignores the most obvious explanation of the phrase, 'the district of the nations', viz. that this northern district was so named *from the time of Israel's earliest occupation of Canaan*, because the foreign element, from the first, largely predominated over the Israelite? Judges i 30–33 (J) claims no conquests for Zebulon, Asher, and Naphtali, but tells us, on the contrary, that they failed to expel the inhabitants of certain specified cities, and settled down among them.[1] The same reference to this foreign element in northern Canaan is found in חֲרֹשֶׁת הַגּוֹיִם 'Harosheth of the nations', mentioned as the home of Sisera in Judges iv 2, 13, 16; a locality which, whether it corresponds to the modern *el-Ḥarîṯîye*, on the right bank of the lower Kishon, or is to be looked for further north, would in any case fall within the district denoted by הַגָּלִיל. For the rest, my explanation of the fact that Isaiah 'ignored the crushing blow which came upon [Samaria] in 722', is the relatively simple one that this had not yet occurred when he wrote. The evidence afforded by 2 Kings xv 29 that it was North Israel and Gilead which was ravaged and depopulated by Tiglath-Pileser is in entire accord with Isa. viii 23^{b} ('the district' is expressly mentioned as included in 'all the land of Naphtali'), and we have absolutely no grounds for doubting this information, derived doubtless from the contemporary annals of the Northern Kingdom. If Tiglath-Pileser claims, in the very fragmentary copy of his Annals which is known to us, to have deported 'the whole of the inhabitants' of the land of Israel to Assyria,[2] no student of Assyrian annals would take this boast very seriously;[3] and the fact that the Assyrian king immediately continues, 'Pekah, their king, they

[1] Quite possibly these northern Israelitish tribes were already settled in Canaan when the central tribes made their entry under Joshua. Cf. my article in *J.T.S.* vol. ix pp. 334 f.

[2] (*mât*) *Bît-Ḫu-um-ri-a*, '(land) the House of Omri' occurs at the end of one broken line, *pu-ḫur niše-šu*, 'the whole of its inhabitants' at the end of the next; and we cannot say for certain that some qualification did not intervene; though, from what we know of the exaggerated boasting of Assyrian annals, it is probable that this is not so.

[3] It is appropriate, in this connexion, to notice the fact that, in the case of the campaign of Sargon's first year against Merodach-Baladan, king of Kaldu, and Ḫumbanigaš, king of Elam, we have the opinions of both sides as to the result of the campaign. Sargon (*Cylinder Inscr.* l. 17) describes himself as 'the brave hero who met Ḫumbanigaš of Elam at Durilu, and accomplished his defeat'; while the Babylonian Chronicle states, on the other hand, that, 'in the second year of Merodach-Baladan, Ḫumbanigaš, king of Elam, inflicted a defeat upon Sargon, king of Assyria, in the district of Durilu' (*Chron.* col. i ll. 33, 34).

deposed, Hoshea [to rei]gn over them I appointed',[1] favours the inference that the nobles of Samaria did not wait for Tiglath-Pileser to advance further south, but made terms with him by executing their king and accepting the nominee of Assyria, thus escaping the devastation inflicted on the districts mentioned in 2 Kings xv 29 and Isa. viii 23b.

III

THE THREE SERPENTS OF ISAIAH XXVII 1.

For the purposes of this note I take for granted the post-exilic date of Isa. xxiv–xxvii, and the apocalyptic character of the prophecy as a whole. The questions of the closer dating of the prophecy, and its possibly composite character, it does not in this connexion concern me to discuss. The principal apocalyptic feature is apparent in the dominant conception of a great world-judgement. This judgement seems to culminate in the symbolical description of *ch.* xxvii 1: 'In that day Yahwe with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the fugitive serpent, and leviathan the winding serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea.'

The interpretation of this passage has hitherto baffled expositors. It is generally supposed that there is reference to three great empires which were dominant at the time when the prophecy was penned. If this is so, Egypt is denoted by 'the dragon that is in the sea'; the identification of the two serpents depends upon the more exact dating of the prophecy:—'If the prophet wrote during or soon after the Exile they might denote Assyria and Babylonia; if at a later period, perhaps Babylonia and Persia, or even Persia and Greece.'[2]

In view, however, of the strongly marked eschatological character of the prophecy, the theory asserts itself that the writer's prospect is not limited by the temporal circumstances of his own age. Quite probably he may have in mind, not three specific empires which were dominant when he wrote, but the powers of evil generally in final antagonism to Yahwe at the end of the age. Before this can be determined, there is another question which calls for solution, viz. the origin of the peculiar symbolism employed by the writer.

The purpose of this note is to suggest (1) that the three serpents are in origin astronomical, and (2) that the conception of them is derived, as might be expected, from Babylonia.

That the serpents are astronomical suggests itself to me from the fact that there are three constellations which take the form of different kinds of serpents, viz. *Serpens*, *Draco*, and *Hydra*.

[1] *Pa-ḫa-ḫa šarru-šu-nu is-ḫi-pu-ma A-u-si-'* [*a-na šarrû-ti*]*-na eli-šu-nu aš-kun.* Cf. Rost *Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglat-Pilesers III* p. 80.

[2] Skinner *Isaiah* i p. 199.

I would identify נָחָשׁ בָּרִחַ, 'the fugitive serpent', with the constellation *Serpens*, a little to the north of the Ecliptic. This נָחָשׁ בָּרִחַ is mentioned again in Job xxvi 13, in a connexion which suggests, if it does not prove, that it is a celestial phenomenon; and the common, though unwarranted, assumption is that it represents a mythical dragon which was supposed by the ancients to devour the heavenly bodies during eclipses. In close connexion with *Serpens* is another constellation, *Ophiuchus*, 'the serpent-grasper', representing to the Greeks the arms and shoulders of a man who is grasping the serpent with both hands, and variously identified by them with Herakles, Prometheus, &c.[1] May we here find the origin of the statement in Job xxvi 13—'His hand hath pierced the fugitive serpent'—Ophiuchus, for the writer of Job, representing the hands of Yahwe, transfixing the serpent with his weapon as it turns to flee from him? Such an idea is not in itself less probable than the kindred idea that it was Yahwe who fastened 'the bands' (belt) of Orion, and so kept him chained in the sky (Job xxxviii 31).

נָחָשׁ עֲקַלָּתוֹן, 'the winding' or 'crooked serpent', I take to be the constellation *Draco*, which winds its long-drawn length between *Ursa major* and *Ursa minor*, in the neighbourhood of the North Pole. According to Dr Schiaparelli,[2] the Dragon is 'a constellation whose shape does not carry conviction, just as, for that matter, the two other serpents of the sky, the serpent of Ophiuchus and the Hydra, have no obvious shape, and are mere expedients for filling up'. With all deference to such an authority, I cannot admit that this is so. Personally, I always regard *Draco* as one of the most striking objects in the sky upon a bright starry night; and that this was the view of the ancients seems to be indicated by the fact that Aratus speaks of the constellation as *μέγα θαῦμα*,[3] and especially by Ovid's comparison of it with the dragon which confronted Cadmus:—

> 'Ille volubilibus squamosos nexibus orbes
> Torquet et immensos saltu sinuatur in arcus,
> Ac media plus parte leves erectus in auras
> Despicit omne nemus, tantoque est corpore, quanto,
> Si totum spectes, geminas qui separat Arctos.'[4]

Here is no reference to a constellation of 'no obvious shape', recognizable only to astronomers, but to a celestial monster which would be familiar enough to the poet's readers, and would convey to them a conception of the gigantic, winding form of the dragon which suddenly

[1] Cf. the Scholiast to Aratus, ll. 74 ff.
[2] *Astronomy in the Old Testament* (Eng. trans.) § 54 p. 72.
[3] l. 46.
[4] *Metamorphoses* iii ll. 41–45.

presented itself to the astonished gaze of Cadmus and his companions. Certainly no epithet in Hebrew could better describe the bold curves of the celestial *Draco* than עֲקַלָּתוֹן 'crooked', or 'winding'.

The third serpent, הַתַּנִּין אֲשֶׁר בַּיָּם, 'the dragon that is in the sea', corresponds, as I believe, to *Hydra*. Why should this constellation bear the name *Hydra*, 'the *water*-snake', there being nothing in its form to suggest that it is an inhabitant of the water rather than of the land? The answer, I feel confident, is that, lying, as it does, to the south of the Ecliptic, it is in the Heavenly Ocean, and must therefore be supposed to swim. For the Babylonians there were three divisions of the heavenly universe corresponding to the three divisions of the earthly universe. That is to say, just as the earth is bounded above by the upper air, and around and below by the watery deep, so is the Ecliptic or Zodiac circle (the heavenly counterpart of the earth) bounded above by the northern heavens with the North Pole as their zenith, and around and below by the southern heavens south of the Ecliptic, which figures as the Heavenly Ocean.[1] This suggestion, which carries the origin of the name *Hydra* back to the Babylonians, offers an explanation for the choice of such a name which, so far as I am aware, has previously been wanting.

Assuming, then, that the three serpents are astronomical, can evidence be brought to indicate that the conception of them is derived from Babylonia? As to the existence of a popular mythology among the Hebrews, having its roots in the mythology of the Babylonians, I need not pause to argue. All that is necessary is to refer in passing to the existence of a primitive form of the Creation-myth in which the conflict between Yahwe and Rahab or the Dragon (i. e. *Tiâmat*) must have taken a form much more closely approximating to the Babylonian Creation-narrative than does the story of Creation as given in Genesis. Traces of this primitive myth are abundantly evident in the Prophets, the Psalms, and Job.[2] Granted, then, the mythological character of our passage, and assuming its connexion with astronomy, it is reasonable to look for Babylonian connexions.

The fact ought not to escape notice, that, assuming my explanation of the three serpents as *Serpens*, *Draco*, and *Hydra*, we have a serpent for each of the three divisions of the heavens as contemplated by the Babylonians. *Serpens*, from its proximity to the Ecliptic, may be taken as the earthly serpent, and so is *merely Serpens*, an ordinary serpent, since it has no occasion to do anything but crawl. *Draco*, which winds about the North Pole is the heavenly serpent, and its habitat demands

[1] Cf. Jeremias *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients* pp. 6 ff.

[2] Cf. Zimmern *The Babylonian and the Hebrew Genesis* pp. 8 ff, and, more recently, Oesterley *The Evolution of the Messianic Idea* pp. 45 ff.

that it should be a dragon or flying serpent. *Hydra* is the swimming sea-serpent, inhabiting the Heavenly Ocean.

We read in Tablet I of the Babylonian narrative that, after the mingling of the waters of primaeval *Apsû* (Ocean) and *Tiâmat* (the watery Deep), the mother of all things,

> 'Then were created the gods in the midst of [heaven],
> Laḫmu and Laḫamu were called into being [. .].
> Ages increased [. . . .],
> Then Anšar and Kišar were created, and over them [. . . .].'[1]

Now *Laḫmu* and *Laḫamu* are generally regarded by scholars as serpent-forms.[2] *Anšar* and *Kišar* are personifications respectively of 'the host of heaven' and 'the host of earth'. Is it not possible that, since *Laḫmu* and *Laḫamu* stand in parallelism to *Anšar* and *Kišar*, they may denote respectively the heavenly serpent and the earthly serpent? If this is so, *Laḫmu* answers to *Draco*, 'the winding serpent', and *Laḫamu* to *Serpens*, 'the fugitive serpent'. *Tiâmat* herself doubtless corresponds to *Hydra*, 'the dragon which is in the sea', since it is clear from other passages that she is thought of both as the watery deep and the dragon which inhabits it.[3]

I believe that we can advance further still. In Isa. xxiv 21 we have a passage phrased in a way remarkably similar to xxvii 1. We read that 'it shall come to pass in that day that Yahwe shall punish the host of the Height in the Height, and the kings of the Earth upon the Earth'. The expression 'the host of the Height' (צְבָא הַמָּרוֹם) is remarkable, and is not the ordinary expression used to denote the host of Heaven (צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם).

מָרוֹם 'the Height' is not, I think, merely a choice synonym for הַשָּׁמַיִם 'the heavens'. It seems usually to denote, whether explicitly or implicitly, the north pole or zenith of the Ecliptic (Babylonian *Anu*), i. e. the highest point of the heavens regarded as the abode of Deity.[4] May we not, then, in 'the host of the Height', &c. actually find an echo of the Babylonian *Anšar* and *Kišar*? If this is so, we have, upon my theory, the following five identifications :—

'The host of the Height in the Height'	= *Anšar*
'The kings of the Earth upon the Earth'	= *Kišar*
'Leviathan, the fugitive serpent'	= *Laḫamu*
'Leviathan, the winding serpent'	= *Laḫmu*
'The dragon that is in the Sea'	= *Tiâmat*

[1] The translation is that of King *The Seven Tablets of Creation* i pp. 4 f.

[2] See references in Muss-Arnolt's Dictionary i p. 478.

[3] Cf. Isa. li 9, Ps. lxxiv 13.

[4] Cf. especially Isa. xxxii 15, xxxiii 5, lvii 15, Mic. vi 6, Jer. xxv 30, Lam. i 13, Ps. vii 8, xviii 17, lxviii 19, xciii 4, cii 20, cxliv 7.

It is true, of course, that in the primitive Babylonian myth, *Anšar* and *Kišar*, *Laḫmu* and *Laḫamu*, and the gods who are subsequently produced, represent the forces of kosmos in conflict with primaeval chaos represented by *Tiâmat*. But, with the adoption of the mythology as a mere *symbolism* by writers to whom Yahwe was the only God, it is natural that the perspective should be altered, and that all that savours of polytheism should stand in opposition to the One who is supreme.

C. F. BURNEY.

SAINT AUGUSTINE'S BIBLE AND THE *ITALA*.

II

The Gospel Quotations in the De Consensu.

THE treatise of S. Augustine called *De Consensu Euangelistarum* is nothing less than a critical study of the Synoptic Problem, with the problem of the Fourth Gospel thrown in. Naturally it is full of extracts from all four Gospels, often quoted with particular stress laid upon a certain word or phrase. Augustine's contribution to historical criticism need not be examined here, but it is obvious how valuable a work like this may be to the textual critic, if only we can be sure of Augustine's own text. The work was admirably edited in 1904 by Weihrich (*CSEL.* vol. 43), who gives reasons for believing that the treatise was written at the end of the year 399.

The first thing that strikes the reader with regard to the Gospel quotations in the *De Consensu* is that they agree generally with the Vulgate. The Vulgate Gospels had been published in 384, fifteen years before; less than four years later, in 403, Augustine wrote to Jerome thus: 'Proinde non paruas Deo gratias agimus de opere tuo quod *Euangelium* ex Graeco interpretatus es, quia paene in omnibus nulla offensio est' (*Ep.* 104). It would therefore not be surprising that in a critical work Augustine should use the new and scientific revision, the execution of which he himself actually approved.

Dr Vogels of Munich, however, has brought forward the theory that the Vulgate element in the Gospel extracts in the *De Consensu* is intrusive.[1] Some editor has altered the text: 'Burkitt hat nicht ernstlich genug mit der Möglichkeit gerechnet, dass der Evangelientext auch gefälscht sein könne' (p. 270). Readers of the *Journal of Theological Studies* for October 1909 will see Dr Souter's opinion of Dr Vogels' thesis. But I feel that in the circumstances it will

[1] *Biblische Zeitschrift* for 1906, 267–295, repeated in *Biblische Studien* xiii 5, pp. 477–506 (1908).