

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY

VOL. XXXVI.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 8, Adelphi Terrace, Charing Cross, W.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1904.

ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.*

MARTIN L. ROUSE, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed.

The following paper was read by the author :—

*ON THE SYNCHRONOUS CHRONOLOGY OF THE
KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH.* By FREDERICK GARD
FLEAY, Esq., M.A., author of *Egyptian Chronology*, etc.

IN late years a tendency has developed to disparage the historical accuracy of the book of Kings. This has been caused by the difficulty in harmonizing the chronological details of the Hebrew text with the most recent discoveries made in deciphering the Assyrian records. According to the method adopted by the most eminent Assyriologists the result is : first, that the reigns of Uzziah and Jeroboam II. have each to be diminished by twenty years, which, as they were contemporary, is a quite admissible hypothesis ; such an error of a round number has its parallels in other places in the sacred text, and its admission would in no way affect any other detail in the chronology.

But secondly, the scheme devised by the united efforts of the most eminent authorities in matters of oriental philology, and adopted by the most popular expositors of Assyriology among the English public, requires also the following changes : for Jotham, 2 years instead of 15 ; Ahaz, 7 for 15 ; Omri, 8 for 12 ;

* Monday, April 25th, 1904.

Joram, 8 for 12; Menahem, 4 for 10; Pekah, 3 for 20; Hoshea, 7 or 11 for 9; beside various other minute alterations. If such arbitrary changes be really required, the author of the book of Kings and the authors of the books of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and Israel, to which he refers as his principal authorities, must have been utterly untrustworthy in all matters of chronology; and, if that be the case, there is no trustworthy chronology in the whole of the Old Testament. Before assenting to this startling proposition, it may be well to examine the details of years mentioned in the Book of Kings. Possibly Arithmetic, Logic and Common Sense may help us as well as Assyriology and Philology.

The only attempt in the conservative direction at all noteworthy which I have met with is that of Oppert. He assumes too large a hiatus in the list of Assyrian eponyms, invents a second Menahem, separates Pul from Tiglath Pileser, and is on the whole rather more wild and extravagant than his opponents. Nevertheless I feel that the hypotheses of the Assyriologists are *primâ facie* so improbable that it is quite worth while to reopen the question, which I now proceed to do.

I take as starting point for my reckoning the taking of Samaria by Shalmaneser, or rather by Sargon, in 722 B.C., a date which is fixed within a month or two by universal acceptance of all authorities; and from this, by the calculations to be given hereunder, I arrive at 962 B.C. for the accession of Rehoboam and the separation of Judah and Israel. The first problem before us is to account for the difference between 240 years thus assigned to the existence of the divided monarchies and 260 years or 241 years, which are the numbers arising from the addition of the items in the text for Judah and Israel respectively, without contradicting the dates required by the Assyrian monuments.

There are many apparent discrepancies of one or two years between the lists of the Kings of Judah and Israel on which I shall say a word further on. At present I confine myself to the larger and more important differences.

The first of these is the statement 2 Kings xv, 1, that Azariah's accession took place in the 27th year of Jeroboam II. This is impossible; but the impossibility has always been recognised, and the new Assyriological scheme has nothing to add to the old orthodox solution, viz., for 27 read 14 (the 27th year from the *end* of Jeroboam's reign).

The second difficulty is the difference in the total reckonings of Judah and Israel. This amounts to 19 years, and used to be

accounted for by assuming 19 years interregnum in the Israel list. These interregnums throw the reign of Jehu too far back, and are as irreconcilable with the Assyrian monuments for that king as they are with the Egyptian for the reign of Rehoboam. All this is obviated by making the superfluous 19 or 20 years the length of the time that Uzziah lived in leprous seclusion during the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz, 2 Kings xv, 5. This gives his reign 32 years alone, and 20 contemporary; brings his death to 739 or 740 B.C., the exact year that modern critics desiderate for the call of Isaiah, Is. vi, 1; and allows him several years contemporaneous with Menahem, agreeably to the Assyrian monumental evidence to that effect.

Before considering the third difficulty, the contemporaneity of Menahem and Tiglath Pileser, I must prepare the way by enumerating the data that have been recovered from the history of Assyria, and before doing this I must lay before you a statement of the triple problem to be solved.

Firstly, the dates of the Kings of Israel and Judah must be reconciled; this, as I have already shown, is accomplished by the assumption of a co-regnancy between Uzziah and his successors Jotham and Ahaz for twenty years, a co-regnancy which is demanded as regards Jotham by the sacred text: "The king Azariah dwelt in a several house, and Jotham the king's son judged the people of the land."

Secondly, the Egyptian reckoning for Shashank (Shishak) must agree with the Hebrew for Solomon and Jeroboam. It will be found further on that this is effectually done on the now proposed scheme: but no other system hitherto proposed can be forced into agreement with the Manethonic numbers: some authors shift the date of Shishak a score of years up, others a similar interval down; but all make their alterations ineffectually and without authority.

Thirdly, the Assyrian records, official and therefore authoritative, cannot possibly be in contradiction with the true reckoning (as I contend) preserved in the Hebrew texts. To Oppert belongs the credit of suggesting the existence of a break in the list of Assyrian eponyms between Assur nirari and Tiglath Pileser. If any historic truth lies at the foundation of the Sardanapalus legend as given by Ctesias, if the Medes did for some twenty-five years exercise supremacy over Assyria, if Arbaces and Belesis are not mere figments of a dream, whatever may be true in their history must be introduced somewhere in the eponym list. But Oppert's interval

forty-six years, calculated to suit his date, 1017, for Solomon, is too long, and his separation of Pul and Tiglath Pileser is disproved by the Assyrian monuments.

I defer further discussion of this important crux to a later stage of the argument when all the data necessary thereto shall have been set forth; but here I may remark that it is only in comparatively recent years that Assyriologists, who previously held to Oppert's views, have discovered (without any new evidence having arisen) that the eponym list *must be* continuous; and about the same time also discovered that so many ancient authorities, Herodotus, the Old Testament writers, Manetho, etc., were utterly untrustworthy.

Now we come to the fourth and last difficulty, the contemporaneity of Menahem and Pul.

[744-3] Pekah and Rezin King of Syria invade Judah, 2 Kings xv, 37; xvi, 5, "The Lord began to send them" near the end of the reign of Jotham, and in the first years of Ahaz (743) they besieged him in Jerusalem. He applied to Tiglath Pileser to aid him, and became tributary to him. In 743 Tiglath was in Arpad, which town he besieged for three years and took in 741.

738: Tiglath P., Menahem and Rezin pay tribute to Tiglath. This is the crucial date. According to the ordinary chronology Pekah (not Menahem) was on the throne. Oppert accounts for this discrepancy by inventing a second Menahem with arbitrary dethronements and restorations of Jeroboam and Pekah. The Assyriologists for the most part alter the years for the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, Menahem, and Pekah as may suit their hypotheses.

734. Ahaz pays tribute to Tiglath (Schrader i. 255, transl.) Tiglath in Philistia.

733-2. Tiglath besieges and takes Damascus, where Ahaz meets him. 2 Kings xvi, 10.

732. Rezin of Syria is slain in the 14th year of Tiglath.

731. Paqaha is slain and Hoshea appointed in his place by Tiglath.

At this point I insert the undated annals, iii Rawl. 10, No. 2, which Schrader puts 734 B.C. In this crucial fragment we find Tiglath at Shi-mir-ra and Ar-ga-a, towns west of Lebanon, Ga-al (Gilead), [A]bel [Beth Manchah], Beth Omri (Samaria) and Gaza; then follows: "The whole of its (Samaria's) inhabitants I . . . deported to Assyria; Pa-qa-ha their king I slew, Hosea I appointed over them." This comes in quite naturally

between 2 Kings xvi, 10, when Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath after that town had been taken, B.C. 732, and 2 Kings xvii, 1, when Hoshea's reign began, B.C. 731 : it does not suit B.C. 734, when Ahaz paid tribute indeed, but Samaria had certainly not been deported: yet, because in 734 the list of governors mentions Tiglath's campaign to Philistia, and in 732 does not mention that to Samaria specifically, but includes it in that to Damascus (which is far more consistent than including it in that to Philistia), the Assyriologists put it at the earlier date, thus introducing a purely unnecessary discordance with the simple Scriptural narrative, and greatly confusing the historic sequence in Assyria.

Such in outline are the meagre but really sufficient data for this dozen years, derivable from the Assyrian annals of Tiglath Pileser and the Book of Kings. The difficult point to determine is the identity of Paqaha. At first sight it is natural to identify him with Pekah. But the retention of Pekah as the predecessor of Hoshea entails all the arbitrary mutilations of four reigns which I have previously noticed. The name Pekahiah seems to lend itself to the transliteration Paqaha just as well as Pekah; for, although —iah is represented by —au in Hazakiau for Hezekiah and Assiyaau for Azariah, this latter name also appears as Asriau. If we take then Paqaha to be Pekahiah and transfer Pekah to a position between Zechariah and Shallum, perfect agreement with the Assyrian annals will be obtained, and any alteration of regnal years in the Hebrew text will be unnecessary.

Let us then examine the text and ascertain whether any violent or impracticable changes are involved in this hypothesis.

The order of the restored text will be—

Zechariah	v. 4-9, 11-12.
Pekah	v. 27-29, 31.
Shallum	v. 10, 13-16.
Menahem	v. 17-22.
Pekahiah	v. 23-26.

The change in the order is confined to the replacement of 5 verses: 10, 27, 28, 19, 31: and no syllable of the text itself would be interfered with; but there is one verse (30) which is not enumerated above for which I can find no defence in any way. That Hoshea did not obtain the throne by an independent conspiracy, but was appointed by Tiglath, who had smitten Pekah, we know from the Assyrian annals; and the 20th year of Jotham is an impossible date; for Jotham

reigned only 16 years. If Hoshea's predecessor was Pekah, son of Remaliah, we cannot evade the difficulties which I have already pointed out; but they disappear if this verse be rejected, as it must be, on the ground that its writer was ignorant of the facts now disclosed in the annals of Assyria and of the chronology of the neighbouring kingdom of Judah. Moreover, he contradicts 2 Kings xvii, 1, which assigns the accession of Hoshea to the 12th year of Ahaz, which cannot by any means be identified with the impossible 20th of Jotham. An exactly similar instance of insertion of an unauthentic verse occurs in 2 Kings i, 17, where Joram of Israel is said to accede in the 2nd year of Jehoram of Judah, in direct contradiction to 8, 16, where the true statement is given, viz., that the accession of Jehoram of Judah took place in the 5th year of Joram of Israel.

How the error in the case of Pekah may have arisen is easy to explain. It is clear that "the chronicles of the Kings of Israel" were arranged under the headings of the "acts" of the several kings in independent documents. Let us separate them thus:—

Acts of Zechariah	...	v. 8-9, ^A 11-12.
„ Pekah	...	v. 25, 27-29, ^A 31.
„ Shallum	...	v. 10, 13, ^A 15.
„ Menahem	...	v. 14 16-22.
„ Pekahiah	...	v. 23-24, ^A 26.
„ Hoshea	...	v. 30, ch. xvii, 1-41.

When the Book of Kings was compiled, the four verses 25, 10, 14, 30, which I will call "head links" were inserted in the four places marked by carets (^A) respectively, so as to bind the narrative into a consecutive whole. Zechariah and Pekahiah are fixed in position as sons of their predecessors Jeroboam and Menahem, and in the head link, v. 14, "Menahem, son of Gadi, . . . smote Shallum, son of Jabesh," is definite and conclusive. The succession of all the kings except Pekah is therefore fixed. But the head link v. 30 has been shown not to be authentic, and those in v. 25 and v. 10 are not definite. We have only, "Pekah son of Remaliah smote *him*," and "Shallum son of Jabesh smote *him*," in place of expressly stated names defining the kings smitten; this leaves it open to insert Pekah either after Zechariah or after Pekahiah, and unfortunately he was inserted in the wrong place, and the surreptitious verse 30 was afterwards put in to justify the wrong insertion.

All the Assyrian data are thus shown to be compatible with the Hebrew narrative.

Turning from the synchronisms with the Assyrian annals to those of Egypt, the first Pharaoh we meet with is Shishak; to whom Jeroboam fled in the time of Solomon, 1 Kings xi, 40, and who came up against Jerusalem, B.C. 958, in 5 Rehoboam, 1 Kings xiv, 25. This king was certainly Shashank Hezkeper-ra, the first King of Dynasty XXII. His date, according to Manetho, reckoning from 340 B.C. as the close of native sovereignty in Egypt, was 978 to 957, and this agrees with the old Egyptian chronicle as shown in my *Egyptian Chronology*. Assyriologists and Egyptologists alike have striven hard to reduce this king's accession by 20 or even 50 years; but they have only done so to their own satisfaction by arbitrary alterations without a shadow of proof.

Zerah the Ethiopian, who came against Asa, 2 Chron. xiv, 9, some time in the last 30 years of his reign, 930-901 B.C., comes within the data limits of the same Egyptian Dynasty XXII, but has not been certainly identified as yet, and is therefore not capable of synchronic comparison.

So or Seva, 2 Kings xvii, 4, to whom Hoshea sent between 731 and 722 B.C., when Shalmaneser "found conspiracy" in him, was unquestionably Sabaca (Shabak) Dynasty XXVI; his date according to Manetho was 714-706; but, on comparison with the monuments, the old Egyptian chronicle and Herodotus, it appears that he was claimant to the throne of Egypt in succession to Kashta in the Ethiopian line as early as the time of Zet and before Bokenranf, and therefore before 722. See on this point my *Egyptian Chronology*, p. 81. In just the same way we find Tirhakah, 2 Kings xix, 9, King of Ethiopia, coming out to fight against Sennacherib in 702-1, although the date usually given for Taharaka is 693 to 685. Here again Manetho and the Chronicle require a date of 703 for this reign; and so does Herodotus, who calls him Sethon. The only way to elucidate all these contemporary Egyptian dynasties will be to tabulate them as follows:—

B.C.	Manetho.	Chronicle.	Herodotus.
810	40.y. Petubastes	19.y. { Miamun Nut. Piankhi.	
791	...	44 Three Saites.	
770	8 Osorcho		
762	10 Psammus		
752	31 Zet		50.c.y. { Amyr- tæus. Sabaco.
747	...	44 { Kashta [22] Shabak [8]	
725	...		
721	6 Bocchoris		
717	...	Shabak & Shabatak [4].	
715	8 Sabacon (read 2)		
713	...	Shabatak [8].	
713	14 Sebichus („ 10)		
705	...	Shabatak & Taharka [2]	37 Sethon.
703	{ 18 Ammeres (Eus.) 18 Tarkus	37 Taharaka.	
685	7 Stefinates		
678	6 Nechapsos		
672	6 Nechoa (8 ap.)		
666	54 Psammeticus	54 Psamtik	54 Dodekarchy & Psam.
612	[1]6 Nechoa II	16 Necho	16 Neka
596	6 Psammathis	6 Psamtok	6 Psamaris.
590	19 Vafris	19 Uahabra	25 Apries [read 19].
571	44 Amosis	44 Aahmes	44 Amosis.
527	0,6 Psammecheritis	0,6	0,6 Psammeni- tus.
527			
		177 stated total.	

These dates are certain within a year or two, the names for the Chronicle are inferred by me from the history as given by monumental inscriptions. The years of the dynasties only are given by the Chronicle as below to which I append Manetho's for comparison.

	Chronicle.	Manetho.
xxiii	19.y. 2 Diopolites	89.y. 4 Tanites.
xxiv	44 3 Saites	6 1 Saite.
xxv	44 3 Ethiopians	40 3 Ethiop [30].
xxvi	177 7 Memphites	150,6 9 Saites [159].
	284	285,6

Manetho by the omission of 10 years for Necho II dislocated all his dates from Dyn. XXIV to XXVI. He recovers his ten years partly by counting the 6 years for Bocchoris twice over; once for Bokenranf himself and again in the 8 years of Sabacon with whom he was contemporary: the other 4 years he gets by counting the co-regnancy of Shabak and Shabatak twice over, once for each king: this point is so important that I venture to repeat a portion of the table with enlargements showing how Manetho (as in Africanus) and the Chronicle (from whom Eusebius must have obtained his version) derived their numerical data.

B.C.	Afric.		Euseb.	
725		4	12	Zet : Shabak.
721		4		Bokenranf : Shabak.
717	8	2	12	Bokenranf : Shabak and Shabatak.
715		2		Shabak and Shabatak.
713	14	8		Shabatak.
705		2	20	Shabatak and Taharqa.
703	18	18		Taharqa.

Tabulation does not make easy reading, but it affords the most convincing test for those who will take the trouble to examine it. I therefore risk the charge of dullness by giving yet another table of the accessions of the contemporary kings for Judah, Israel, Egypt and Assyria mentioned in the Old Testament:—

B.C.	Judah.	Israel.	Egypt.	Assyria.
978	Shishak.	
961	Rehoboam ...	Jeroboam ...	dies 957.	
945	Abijah.			
944	Asa	Zerah : cotem.	
902	...	Ahab.		
885	Shalmaneser.
867	...	Jehu.		
763	...	Pekah.		
745	Tiglath-pileser.
743	Ahaz.			

B.C.	Judah.	Israel.	Egypt.	Assyria.
743	...	Menahem.		
733	...	Pekahiah.		
731	...	Hoshea.		
727	Hezekiah	Shalmaneser.
722	...	Captivity ...	Shabak ...	*Sargon.
705	Tirhakah ...	Sennacherib.
698	Manasseh.			
681	Esarhaddon.
643	Amos.			
641	Josiah.			
613	Necho.	
610	Jehoahaz.			

* Merodach Baladan reigned in Babylonia 722-709, then Sargon 709-704.

For completeness I have carried this table lower than my immediate object requires, but not lower than will be required in future papers, if the series be continued. The Scriptural references are contained in the books of Kings, Chronicles and Isaiah. I give a list of them.

	Kings.	Isaiah.	Chronicles.
Shishak ...	i. 11, 40 ; 14, 25	...	ii. 12, 2-9.
Zerah	ii. 14, 9.
Tiglath Pileser ...	ii. 15, 29 ; 16, 7	...	i. 5, 6 ; 5, 25 ; ii. 28, 20.
(Pul) ...	ii. 15, 19.		
Shalmaneser ...	ii. 17, 3 ; 18, 9.		
So (Shabak) ...	ii. 17, 4.		
Sargon	20, 1.	
Merodach Baladan ...	ii. 20, 12	39, 1.	ii. 32, 31.
Sennacherib ...	ii. 18, 13 ; 19, 16-36.	36, 1 ; 37, 17- 37	ii. 32, 1-23.
Tirhakah ...	ii. 19, 9 ...	37, 9 ...	
Esarhaddon ...	ii. 19, 37	37, 38 ...	? ii. 33, 11.
Necho ...	ii. 23, 33	...	ii. 35, 20.

At this stage of the discussion I may state as a main result of my own investigations that at the very root of the rash and hasty, but elaborate and ingenious hypotheses, that are sapping the belief of modern criticism in all ancient authorities whether sacred or profane, from Herodotus and Manetho to the Biblical Historians and Prophets, there lies one radical evil habit, which is gradually but surely undermining the slow but scientific method of historic investigation, namely, the assumption of the truth of some one datum, which however probable is not proved, and on it building a superstructure, which ultimately collapses, because its foundation is not on a rock. Haste for ephemeral popularity and fear of being anticipated are replacing the Keplerian patience and Newtonian exhaustiveness of our forefathers. For instance, Schrader denies the existence of any gap in the Assyrian eponym list; Sayce, Driver, Cheyne (I mention only such authors as are generally read in England), adopt the consequent disparagement of the Old Testament history, which I have in this paper endeavoured to refute; Oppert invents a new king and advocates the baseless notion of dethronements and restorations of Israelite kings; Budge introduces a second siege of Jerusalem shortly before the death of Sennacherib, all baseless fabrics built on some fanciful assumption.

I might mention many more such instances, but will content myself with one. It seems so plausible that the great Rameses II should be the oppressor of the Hebrews, and his successor the Pharaoh of the Exodus, that hardly a dissentient voice is audible on this matter. One consequence is that the whole Hebrew history from Moses to Solomon has to be condensed into two centuries, or thrown over altogether. I need hardly say that to me such a hypothesis is totally incredible; and that I, as I have shown in my *Egyptian Chronology*, prefer the older authorities, the book of Judges, and Manetho to Josephus and his modern followers.

I now give a general table for all the kings of Judah and Israel.

SYNCHRONOUS TABLE.

Judah.	Reign.	B.C.	B.C.	Reign.	Israel.
Temple	37	999		...	
Rehoboam	17	962	962	22	Jeroboam.
Abijah	3	945	18
Asa	41	942	2.c.
2	940	2	Nadab.
3	938	24.c.	Baasha.
26	915	2.c.	Elah.
27	914	12.c.	Omri.
38	903	22	Ahab.
Jehoshaphat	25	901	4
+17	881	2	Ahaziah.
+18	879	12	Joram.
Jehoram	8	876	5
Ahaziah	1	868	12 or 11
Athaliah	7	867	867	2[9]	Jehu.
Jehoash	40	860	7
23	838	17	Jehoahaz.
+37	821	16	Joash.
Amaziah	29	820	2
15	805	41	Jeroboam.
Azariah	[32]	791	+27
+38	764	0,6	Zechariah.
+52	763	20	Pekah.
Jotham	16	759	2
Ahaz	16	743	+17
+39 Az.	743	0,1	Shallum.
+39 Az.	743	10	Menahem.
+50 Az.	733	2	Pekahiah.
12 Ahaz, +20 J.+	731	9	Hosea.
Hezekiah	5	727	...	240	Sum.
Sum	240	...	722	...	Captivity.
Hezekiah	24	
Manasseh	55	698	
Amon	2	643	
Josiah	31	641	
Jehoahaz	0,3	610	
Jehoiakin	11	610	
Jehoiachin	0,3	599	
Zedekiah	11	598	
Captivity	587	

The regnal numbers are taken without alteration from the Hebrew text, twenty years being allowed for the co-regnancy of Uzziah with Jotham and Ahaz, and one year for the insurrection of Jehu before his recognized accession. Quite possibly

this year may be omitted, and the years of Athaliah reduced to six. No injury will thereby accrue in any way to my main argument.

In transferring a chronological reckoning from regnal years to dates B.C. an apparent difference of one or two years may arise for three reasons: firstly, the regnal months not being given, it is not possible to tell whether the years stated are in excess or defect of the true amount of years *and* months: we do not even know how many months were considered necessary to justify their being set down as a year; secondly, we do not know the epoch from which the kings' reigns were reckoned: it may have been from the day of accession, it may have been from the New Year's day of the accession year; thirdly, the new years in the Jewish lunar reckoning and in the modern chronologers B.C. begin at different annual epochs. In the absence of more definite data it is impossible to harmonise more closely than to a difference of two years on either side. Much ingenuity has been wasted in attempting to evade this impossibility. I have thought it sufficient to delete those cross references of the compilers which are palpably mistaken in their reckoning. Those in the reign of Uzziah are of course due to my proposed shift of Pekah's position; the others are inherent in the text and cannot be got rid of without conjectural alterations on any hypothesis whatever. These calculations are therefore too inaccurate to be of much help, and the only use I have made of them is to reckon the reigns of Baasha, Elah and Omri as ending in current years not after complete ones; a course which has been taken by all my most important predecessors in this investigation.

If my scheme is correct, one or two passages in the prophetic writings have a new light thrown on them. "The year that king Uzziah died," Isaiah vi, 1, is 740 or 739 B.C. "The two years before the earthquake," Amos i, 1, becomes identified with the narrative in Josephus (*Antiq.* ch. ii) and fixes the date of Amos to 761 B.C., in exact accordance with the results of modern criticism: and the "three shepherds cut off in one month," Zechariah xi, 8, that is to say, before the expiry of the second month, will be Jotham, Pekah and Shallum. This requires the invasion of Pekah to be extremely short, only of a few weeks, and in no other way can I understand how the invasion of Pekah and Rezin, which "began" in the time of Jotham (2 Kings xv, 27) and was so successful in the commencement of the reign of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii), could have been brought to a close so sudden and resultless than by the

conspiracy of Shallum and the consequent change of policy. It seems likely indeed that this invasion of Judah was the motive of the conspiracy; for Jehizkiah, son of Shallum (2 Chron. xxviii, 12) was one of the heads of the children of Ephraim who "stood up against them who came from the war." Surely this is much more likely to have happened immediately on the success of his father's conspiracy than after the interval of three reigns of two distinct stocks (as required in the received arrangement) between the reign of Shallum and the intervention of his powerful son and his three friends.

So much stress has been laid by Duncker and others on the bearing of the statement of Menander as to the reigns of the Phœnician kings, that I must not, though I attach little weight to it as a ground for argument, pass it by unnoticed. This is as good a place for touching on it as any other. *Josephus against Apion*, Book I, quotes Menander to this effect. From the 12th year of Hiram, when the temple of Solomon was built, to the 7th of Pygmalion, when Dido founded Carthage, are 143 years 8 months (say 144 years). I do not give the years for the intervening kings which are defective somewhere by a score of years. If we take the building of Carthage to date 846 B.C., in accordance with Appian (Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, ii, 113), this gives for the Temple date $846 + 144 = 990$ B.C., which is Duncker's date; but if, as I think, Josephus means the completion and dedication of the Temple (not the laying the foundation as Duncker supposes), we must add seven or eight years. This brings us to 998; my own date is 998-9. This would be quite satisfactory, but as Justin's date for the foundation of Carthage is 826, and there are other conflicting testimonies on this point, an equally good case can be made out for the reckoning of the Assyriologers. It is futile to ground any argument on a datum so uncertain; all that I can do, and this I am bound to do and have done, is to show that no inference can be made from Josephus' quotation irreconcilable with the scheme proposed.

Now we have sufficient data before us to be able to discuss that most difficult question; are the eponym lists of Assyria continuous throughout, or is there a break in them either before Tiglath Pileser (as Oppert supposes) or elsewhere? Let us briefly enumerate the facts as given in the book of Kings and the Assyrian records. Rezin or Hazion of Damascus was adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon; his son Jabrison was contemporary with Jeroboam, and his son Benhadad with Baasha. Then comes a King of unknown name, no doubt a son

of Benhadad I, contemporary with Omri, succeeded by his son Benhadad II, contemporary with Ahab. The King of Damascus from the 6th to the 14th year of Shalmaneser is called Dad-idri (Hadadezer) and is almost certainly identified with Benhadad II. Between him and Israel for the three years 18-20 Ahab these was "peace" and alliance; at the extreme end of the 3 years Ahab fought by the side of Dad-idri at the battle of Qar-qar; they were defeated by Shalmaneser in his 6th year. The alliance between Dad-idri and Ahab was thus broken, and that same year Ahab was slain at Ramoth Gilead in fight with his former ally. In the biblical narration, so far as it is taken from the story of Elijah and Elisha, Benhadad II is not mentioned by name; but there is no question as to which "King of Syria" is intended. In 11 Shalmaneser Dad-idri and other Kings of the Khatti and sea coast were routed by the Assyrian King; this must have taken place near about (perhaps immediately after) the "war of the King of Syria against Israel," and the "siege of Samaria by Benhadad" probably as retaliation by Assyria for injury to his Israelitish vassal. In 14 Shalmaneser Dad-idri and 12 Kings were again defeated, and we hear no more of him in Assyrian annals or of Benhadad II. in the Bible.

In 18 Shalmaneser Hazael of Damascus was defeated and tribute received from the Tyrians, Sidonians, and "Jehu son of Omri," evidently at his accession. I think that Jehu was not then "compelled to submit" (as Schrader puts it) but simply continued the vassalage of Joram. Hazael must have succeeded Dad-idri between 14 and 16 Shalmaneser, and in the Bible we find him and no other mentioned as contemporary with Jehu. We next meet with Hazael fighting against Jehoash of Judah, and receiving from him "treasures of the house of the Lord" and gold from the King's house. This was probably in the time of Samsi Rimmon. Jehoahaz was also contemporary with Hazael, who died and was succeeded by Benhadad III, somewhere in the reign of Joash. Corresponding to this we find in an Assyrian inscription of 10 Rimmon nirari that he received tribute of the land Omri (*i.e.*, of Joash) the Tyrians, etc., and shut up in Damascus its King Masi. This king I take to be the immediate successor of Hazael and identical with Benhadad III. Hazael died in the reign of Jehoahaz and was succeeded by Benhadad his son, who was king in the reign of Joash when he recovered from him the cities which he had taken in the time of Jehoahaz. There is no reason for a third king between Hazael and Benhadad: and Masi of 10 Rimmon nirari in the time of Jehoahaz, must be anterior to the Benhadad of the time of

Joash. There is no reason why Benhadad III should not have his distinctive name Mazi, as well as Bendadad II that of Dad-idri.

Finally Jeroboam II restored Damascus and Hamath to Israel, and this brings us to the accession of Assur-dan-ilu, after which we get no help from Assyrian records until the annals of Tiglath Pileser.

In the following table I have given all the scriptural references on which the preceding sketch is based, with the parallel successions of the Kings of Damascus and Assyria and B.C. dates according to my reckoning. But the reign of Assur-dan-ilu ends here at 788, and is succeeded by the next eponym, that of Purilsaggali in 763, the year of the eclipse. There is a break of 25 years, and immediately after the table I will offer my explanation.

i, ii Kings.	Israel.	Damascus.	B.C.	Assyria.	Events, &c.
i. 11, 23	1 Solomon ...	Rezin ...	1002	...	Rezin = Hezion.
15, 18	1 Jeroboam ...	Tabrimon ...	962	...	
15, 20	1 Baasha ...	Benhadad I. ...	938	...	
20, 34	1 Omri ...	Father of B. II. ...	914	...	
20, 34	1 Ahab ...	Benhadad II. ...	903	...	Elijah.
22, 1	18 Ahab	884-2	...	3 years' peace.
		Dad-idri ...	880-1	6 Shalmaneser ...	Qarqar.
22, 31	21 Ahab ...	"King" ...	880-1	...	Ramoth Gilead.
ii. 3, 1	1 Joram	878-9	...	Elisha.
5, 1		"King"	Naaman.
6, 8	4 Joram ...	"King" Dad. ...	875-6	11 Shalmaneser ...	War : Isr. Dam., Ass. Dam.
6, 24		B. Dad. ...	874-5	...	Siege Sam. : Sh. routs Dad.
8, 7	7 Joram ...	B. Dad. ...	872-3	14 Shalmaneser ...	Sh. routs Dad. : Elisha.
8, 15, 28	12 J. = 1 Jehu	Hazael ...	867-8	18 Shalmaneser ...	Jehu tribute to Sh.
10, 32		Hazael ...	864-5	21 Shalmaneser ...	Tyré, etc., tribute to Sh.
12, 17		Hazael	Samsi Rimmon ...	Joash of Judah.
13, 3	Jehoahaz ...	Hazael : B.	
	11 Jehoahaz ...	Mazi ...	827	10 Rimmon-nirari ...	Land Omri tributary.
13, 25	Joash ...	Benhadad ...	821	...	
14, 28	Jeroboam ...		798	1 Assur-dan-ilu ...	Damascus recovered.
			788	...	Zidiil eponym.
			763	Purilsaggali ...	Eclipse of Sun.

Various methods have been tried to explain the discrepancy between the Assyrian and Hebrew reckonings:—

1. The most popular at present is that of the Assyriologers Kamphausen, Schrader, etc., adopted by Sayce, Driver, Cheyne and many other high authorities. They maintain the unbroken continuity of the eponym Canon and sacrifice the Hebrew numbers altogether, but have utterly failed to avoid the contradiction thus introduced between the dates of Shishak and Rehoboam. They do not, however, for the most part, go so far as Robertson Smith, who maintains that the Hebrew numbers were based on cycles of 240 or 480 years, the smaller intervals being filled in by mere guess; a hypothesis utterly unworthy of so sagacious a writer.
2. Another group mostly of writers of lower repute in Assyrian matters, though better acquainted with Egyptian, take refuge in denying the identity of "Ahabbu of Sirhala (Sir'lai)" with Ahab of Samaria, and of "Jehu son of Omri" with Jehu son of Nimshi. These require no refutation.
3. Oppert and others have suggested breaks in the eponym lists at impossible places. Oppert, for instance, would insert 47 years before Tiglath Pileser, but there can be no doubt of the identity of the eclipse in the month Sivan of the eponym Purilsaggali with that of June, 763.
4. The view now proposed that there was a break of 25 or 26 years just before this eponym.

Let us examine the accounts of the Median kings given by Herodotus and Ctesias.

B.C.		Ctesias.	Events.												
	Years.	Kings.	Assur-dan-ilu succeeds. Sardanapalus dies 788 B.C. Eclipse of Sun. Sivan (June).												
791	28	1. Arbaces.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Years.</td> <td>Herodotus.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5[9]</td> <td>3. Deioces.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22</td> <td>4. Fraortes.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40</td> <td>5. Cyaxares. (28 y. Scythians.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>35</td> <td>6. Astyages.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">128 + 28 stated sum.</td> </tr> </table>	Years.	Herodotus.	5[9]	3. Deioces.	22	4. Fraortes.	40	5. Cyaxares. (28 y. Scythians.)	35	6. Astyages.	128 + 28 stated sum.	
Years.	Herodotus.														
5[9]	3. Deioces.														
22	4. Fraortes.														
40	5. Cyaxares. (28 y. Scythians.)														
35	6. Astyages.														
128 + 28 stated sum.															
763	50	2. Mandaucas. Sosarmus, 30 y.													
713	50	3. Artycas.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>29</td> <td>7. Cyrus. Astyages surrenders.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7, 5</td> <td>8. Cambyses.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>9. Darius.</td> </tr> </table>	29	7. Cyrus. Astyages surrenders.	7, 5	8. Cambyses.		9. Darius.						
29	7. Cyrus. Astyages surrenders.														
7, 5	8. Cambyses.														
	9. Darius.														
654	22	4. Arbianes.													
632	40	Artæus. Artynes, 22 y. Astybaras 40 y.													
592		6. Aspadas.													
557															
551															
528															
521															

Herodotus gives only 4 kings before Cyrus and for the first king Deioces 53 years; but his sum, 128 years, excluding the 28 under Scythian rule in the time of Cyaxares, or 156 including them, requires an addition of 6 years to the reign of Deioces. His number for Cyrus is reckoned from an earlier epoch than the final surrender of Astyages, which as well as the epoch of Darius have fixed historical dates 551 and 521. His list only takes us back to 713. But Darius himself states that he had eight predecessors. There are two wanting. Ctesias supplies five, of whom two are evidently replicas of their predecessors; Artynes of Arbianes and Astybaras of Artæus; they reproduce the numbers precisely and are omitted by Herodotus. Taking Sosarmus as the third to be omitted, we get as the date of Artæus' accession 791. If then there be, as I believe, a historical foundation for the story of Sardanapalus, Arbaces conquered him in 788, the 3rd or 4th year of his reign, and ruled over Assyria until 764, the year before the eclipse. That during this foreign reign the institution of eponyms should have been suspended is surely not incredible, and in the "list of governors" there is a line* corresponding with the

* An unexplained line in *Henslowe's Diary* of exactly similar nature gave me the first clue to the change of theatrical companies A.D. 1594, and was the foundation stone of my *History of the English Stage*.

lines which elsewhere in the lists indicate accessions of new kings. If this line does not indicate the regnal portion of Arbaces, what does it indicate? I have found no answer to this question in any book accessible to me.*

I offer no suggestion as to who was king from 763 to 754; perhaps there was none; certainly no Median.

The interval from Qarqar to Jehu's tribute is apparently 12 years in the Assyrian reckoning, 14 in the Hebrew; but if the battle took place early in 6 Shalmaneser and the tribute was paid late in 18 Shalmaneser the real interval may have been nearly 13 years, and these may have fallen in B.C. reckoning apparently 14 years apart. There is no real contradiction in the dates.

There is not much to be learned from the genealogies for this period; we have in the list of the kings of Judah a continuous series of father to son from Solomon to Jeremiah 16 kings in 408 years, with an average of $25\frac{1}{2}$ years for a generation; and 14 high priests for the same time 29 years for a generation, or if we admit Hoshea (Odeas) on the authority of Josephus and the Seder Olam 15 priests 27 years for a generation. All this agrees with the general results obtained from the histories of other countries, but at the same time shows how careful we should be not to *found* our calculations on genealogical lists, but to use them only as tests for conclusions derived from other sources. For the list in 1 Chron. vi, 3-13, omits the six priests between Amariah and Shallum, five of whom are known from other scriptural texts; inserts Ahitub and Zadok instead of them who are certainly misplaced; and transposes Azariah III from his true position after Urijah to one after Hilkiah. All this has been definitely proved by Lord A. Harvey (*Genealogies*, p. 300 *seq.*).

The only other genealogy for this period is that of Elishama, 1 Chron. ii, 25-41, and as this contains eleven generations from Zabad, one of David's warriors, 1 Chron. xi, 41, to Elishama, the grandfather of Ishmael, who smote Gedaliah, 2 Kings xxv, 25; that is to say, thirteen in all for 416 years from 1002 B.C. to 586, we get exactly 32 years for a generation, just what we should expect for a private family not subject to the accidents to which a reigning house is necessarily exposed. On the other hand, if we adopt the scheme of the Assyriologists, we are

* I have in this section used a Latinised transliteration of Greek names for convenience, having taken my table from Browne's *Ordo Sacclorum*, though not without collation with the original authorities.

compelled to make Ahaz father of Hezekiah at the age of twelve, or to reject the regnal years given in the book of Kings. On the whole then the genealogies give, if not extensive, yet valuable confirmation of the truth of the scheme now proposed.

I append a table of the ages of the Kings of Judah, (1) at the birth of their first-born; (2) at their accession to the throne; (3) at their decease, together with the contemporary high priests, which will be useful for reference.

Father.	King.	Dead.	King's Name.	High Priest.
[18	19	59]	Solomon ...	Zadok, 1 K. iv, 2; Ahimaaz, 1 C. vi; Azariah, 1 C. vi, 10.
[23	41	58	Rehoboam ...	Johanam, 1 C. vi.
[22	35	38]	Abijah.	
[21	16	56]	Asa ...	Azariah, 2 C. xv, 1.
28	35	60	Jehoshaphat ...	Amariah, 2 C. xix, 11.
18	32	40	Jehoram ...	Jehoiada, 2 C. xxii, 2.
16	22	23	Ahaziah ...	Jehoiada, 2 C. xxii, 11.
22	7	47	Jehoash ...	Zechariah, 2 C. xxiv, 20.
38	25	54	Amaziah.	
43	16	68	Uzziah ...	Azariah, 2 C. xxvi, 17.
21	25	41	Jotham.	
22	20	36	Ahaz ...	Urijah, 2 K. xvi, 10.
32	[15]	44	Hezekiah ...	Azariah, 2 C. xxxi, 10
45	12	67	Manasseh ...	? Hoshea [Josephus: Sed erolam].
16	22	24	Amon ...	Shallum, 1 C. vi.
14, 6	8	39	Josiah ...	Hilkiah, 2 K. xxii, 4.
28	25	36	Jehoiakim ...	Seraiah, 2 K. xxv, 18.
—	8	8, 3	Jeconiah ...	
—	21	32	Zedekiah ...	Jehozadak, 1 C. vi.

The numbers in square brackets are approximate fillings when no dates are given in the sacred text. The other numbers are taken from the Book of Chronicles, occasionally corrected from the Book of Kings for the second and third columns; the first column is calculated from the other two.

Finally, to sum up the whole matter now before us, there are four typical schemes of chronology for the period of separation between the kingdoms of Judah and Israel:—

First, the Ussherian, which introduces arbitrary inter-regnums, etc., and is in absolute contradiction to the official Assyrian data recovered from the monuments;

Second, Oppert's, which introduces a supposititious second Menahem, and assumes too large a gap in the list of Assyrian eponyms;

Third, the scheme of the modern Assyriologers, which openly asserts the untrustworthiness of the Books of Kings and Chronicles in all matters chronological, and arbitrarily alters the lengths of ten reigns by differences of three to fourteen years; thus cutting away all ground for belief in the historical fidelity of the author of this portion of the Scriptures; and

Fourth, the scheme now proposed which, by inserting 25 years for Arbaces in the eponym lists, and by the transposition of four verses containing the reign of Pekah, but making no other change whatever except in passages which all parties alike admit to require emendation—by these two simple alterations attains both absolute agreement with the Assyrian records and internal self-consistency, and at the same time vindicates the substantial veracity and fidelity of the original Hebrew annalists.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN.—Professor Hull has a letter from Canon Girdlestone bearing on the question.

The SECRETARY read the following:—"I am sorry I cannot be present to hear Mr. Fleay's paper. He has done good service by his work on Egyptian chronology, and this new essay will help us in the right direction. Probably he does not know the Oxford 'Helps to the study of the Bible,' for the chronological part of which I am mainly responsible. It will be found to agree to a considerable extent with his conclusions, but was published about fifteen years ago."

The CHAIRMAN.—We have here some distinguished Assyriologists, and no doubt others who can speak on the subject.

We are greatly indebted to Mr. Fleay for his paper, which must have cost him much time and thought.

Mr. THEO. PINCHES, LL.D.—Although I am an Assyriologist, I may say that I cannot claim to be a chronologist. That is a matter arising partly from my natural incapacity to make long and abstruse calculations, and partly from the fact that there is really so much of a doubtful nature connected with the subject that I have held aloof, as far as possible, from all chronological questions.

The discrepancy of forty years between the Assyrian and Hebrew chronology has been to my mind sufficient reason for keeping myself from any attempts to form a theory of my own. I content myself, in fact, with simply accepting, provisionally, the chronological *data* as given by my contemporaries who have made a speciality of the subject, and that, I think, is best. I am speaking, of course, from my own point of view. My desire has been not to have to make a confession that I have been mistaken. That may have been cowardly on my part, but still I think it was the best course. Assyriology, as you know, is a progressive study. We are constantly learning and constantly having to change the opinions we may have formed, and on that account we may expect, at any time, to find materials necessary for filling up gaps or doing what may be necessary to put things straight from a chronological point of view. I need only mention here that the Germans and the English are working on the site of the ancient city of Asshur, the capital of Assyria, and according to the accounts that have come to hand they have found an enormous amount of material and names, from about 1900 years B.C. to the time of Abraham. They have found the names of kings well known.

Owing to pressure of time I have been unable to read this paper through before coming to the meeting, but on hearing it read now for the first this evening, I feel it my duty to add my testimony to its general excellence. I would here wish to remark that Dr. Budge's introduction of a second siege of Jerusalem, shortly before the death of Sennacherib, is a theory that has found acceptance with a great many Assyriologists, and in fact it seems to suit the case very well, *i.e.*, as far as I was able to judge, when dealing with that portion of Assyrian history in my book on the Old Testament and the records.*

* *The Old Testament in the Light of Historical Records*, 2nd Edit., 1904.

I am quite in agreement with the lecturer concerning the identity of Ahab, and while mentioning that point I may say that instead of reading *Dad-idri* I read Adad-idri. The way in which his name becomes identical with that given in the Old Testament, viz., Benhadad, is because in the Hebrew they omitted the last portion, and the Assyrians omitted the first.

Concerning the matter of the possibility of introducing twenty-five years for Arbaces into the eponym list, that I must leave for the present; but as I have said, if I can find any comments to make tending to illustrate the subject I shall do so, and hope they will be published in the *Transactions* at the end of the discussion.

Professor ORCHARD.—I am sure we shall all agree with what has been said as to the industry and, I might also add, the ingenuity, of the author of this paper.

I note that he assumes a co-regency between Uzziah and his successors Jotham and Ahaz of twenty years. That, so far as I can judge, is a perfectly reasonable assumption. I cannot, however, concur in all the statements of the learned author. In order to work out the theory he is obliged to throw over at least two persons. The passage he refers on page 257 (2nd Book of Kings) he appears to think is indefensible. "I can find no defence," he says, "in any way that Hoshea did not obtain the throne by an independent conspiracy but was appointed by Tiglath, who had smitten Pekah, we know from the Assyrian annals." The probability is that he conspired as agent of Tiglath. Then he says "the 20th year of Jotham" is an impossible date, because he reigned only sixteen years. But the statement is not only that he reigned sixteen years, but that he reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem, and he may easily have reigned for some time afterwards somewhere else. Then the author continues to deal with the supposed difficulty. "Moreover he [the sacred writer] contradicts 2nd Kings xvii, 1, which assigns the accession of Hoshea to the 12th year of Ahaz, which cannot by any means be identified with the impossible 20th of Jotham." The 20th of Jotham is not impossible, nor does there seem to be the difficulty the learned author supposes with regard to that verse. He says, "an exactly similar instance of insertion of an unauthentic verse occurs in 2 Kings i, 17," because of the supposed discrepancy in chapter 8, verse 16, but that may be so read as to cause no discrepancy whatever.

It appears to me that the author, with the best intentions, doubtless, has been somewhat misled by an inordinate estimation of the Assyrian chronology. That it is of great importance cannot be denied. It must, however, be remarked that the Assyrian Records are not quite so inviolable as the author appears to imagine. Again he asserts, "the Assyrian Records, official and therefore authoritative, cannot possibly be in contradiction with the true reckoning (as I contend) preserved in the Hebrew texts." He there makes the Assyrian Records to be the ultimate standard of appeal.

The AUTHOR.—No.

Professor ORCHARD.—It appears to me to be so; but perhaps I was a little hasty in making that assumption. Professor Sayce has pointed out that there are several mistakes in the Assyrian Records with regard to the length of reigns; and Oppert, too, regards those records as being though valuable, unreliable and in his opinion, when there is a difference between the Assyrian Records and the Scripture narrative, that the Scripture narrative should be held to prevail over the Assyrian Records, and I think we should be of the same opinion.

I notice on page 263 of the paper a remark that I thoroughly endorse, where the learned author reminds us that "there lies one radical evil habit, which is gradually but surely undermining the slow but scientific method of historical investigation, viz., the assumption of the truth of some one datum, which, however probable, is not proved, and on it building a superstructure, which ultimately collapses, because its foundation is not on a rock." I venture to say that the assumption in this paper of the untrue datum is the inviolability of these Assyrian Records. We may hope that as this subject is very interesting, we may derive some assistance from those investigations which Dr. Pinches has reminded us are being now carried on by German investigators.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think this paper is very valuable indeed. The author seems to have proved absolutely that there is a gap in the eponym calendar of the Assyrians of twenty-five years.

I would also say that he has incidentally touched on an important point regarding the Exodus. I have always been unable to see that taking Rameses II. as Athaiah, we could ever fit the chronology of Egypt with the chronology of the Hebrews.

As regards Jeroboam II, I think it is not necessary to take the twenty-seven years in the manner usually taken, for I find that by taking it in the ordinary manner, if Uzziah came to the throne as a little child and was under a regent for a time, as may very well have happened, on the sudden death, by assassination, of his father, the twelve years required would be made up, and that would bring us to the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam, instead of the fourteenth as was supposed, about an interval of twelve or thirteen years.

I would also say that I have consulted an eminent physician as to the impossibility, or possibility, of Ahaz having a son at the age of twelve years; or, if you will carefully examine it, at the age of nearly thirteen years, and Dr. Walter Kidd said it is quite possible for such a thing to happen in the East.

It is a mistake to suppose, as is generally done, that the Bible gives us no other means of confirming the chronology of the twin kingdoms of Judah and Israel than its fixing of the accessions in one line in certain regnal years of the other line and *vice versa*. We have one well-known sum total given as a check upon the addition of the individual reigns; and we have another which is little known but more definite. I will take the second in the first place, because it is more definite, that is to say, its initial as well as its final point, is stated.

In the fourth chapter of Ezekiel we read that the prophet is to foretell the siege of Jerusalem which brought the kingdom of Judah to an end in a manner that was common in prophecy by dramatic illustration, namely, first by portraying the city upon a tile and imitating the operations of a siege, and then by lying down many days in succession and eating a small weighed ration of food and water all the time. In directing him to do this God told him that he was to be one day for every year of a certain period "three hundred and ninety days" on his left side to "bear the iniquity of the house of Israel," and "forty days" on his right side to "bear the iniquity of the house of Judah" (vv. 4-6).

Now if we reckon back fourteen years from the beginning of the siege, we come to the revival in the twelfth year of King Josiah, when he destroyed the idols throughout the land, from which time it is to be presumed that little by little iniquity and idolatry gained ground again.

Thus from—

Josiah's 12th to his 31st and the 3 months' reign of Jehoahaz inclusive 20 years.
Jehoiakim's 1st to his 11th and the 3 months' reign of Jehoiachim inclusive 11 „
Zedekiah's 1st to the end of his 9th, when the siege began 9 „
<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 40 „

That Zedekiah's first year was distinct from Jehoiakim's eleventh is proved from Ezekiel xxxiii, 21, where the siege elsewhere said to have ended in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, is said to have ended far in the corresponding part of the twelfth year of Jehoiachim's captivity.

And that Jehoiakim's first year was distinct from Josiah's 31st is proved by another figure given in Ezekiel i, and where the narrative is introduced by the words "In the thirtieth year," and this is further defined to be the fifth year of Jehoiachim's captivity; for by reckoning back in the same way we come to Josiah's passover held in the eighteenth year of his reign, attended by many of the remnant of Israel as well as by the Jews, and described as the most striking one that had been held "since the days of Samuel the prophet"; thus:—

From Josiah's 18th to his 31st and Jehoahaz's 3 months' reign inclusive 14 years.
Jehoiakim's 1st to his 11th inclusive 11 „
Jecooniah's 1st to his 5th 5 „
<hr style="width: 10%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 29 in the 30 „

Having thus proved the accuracy of Ezekiel's sum total in these two cases, let us assume that he is correct in his sum total of 390 years. This then will bring us to the beginning of the declension under Jeroboam; for throughout the history of the northern kingdom his "sin with which he made Israel to sin" was never given up.

Now we have every reason to judge that Jeroboam established his corrupt worship of God in the first year of his reign. Not only is no interval or lengthy event recorded between the secession and

this establishment, but he himself is represented as saying "If this people go up" not "continue to go up" to do sacrifice in Jerusalem, "then shall their heart turn again unto their lord Rehoboam." Therefore we have the whole period from the beginning of the divided monarchy down to the commencement of the great siege given by the Bible as 390 years.

Now this figure I find with very little adjustment in either line to agree with the detailed chronology of the reigns in the kingdoms of Judah and Israel. And further it agrees with the other well known sum total of years given in 2 Chronicles xxxvi, 21. As stated there, the whole period during which the land lay desolate was to be seventy years, that the land might enjoy her sabbaths, or sabbatical years. Therefore the whole sabbatic period up to the end of this desolation (or the completion of Ezra's temple)* was 480 years, or up to the beginning of this desolation it was 420 years.

Now from the beginning of the siege	
(end of Zedekiah's 9th year) to the	
end (middle of his 11th) was	... 2 years.
Add	... 390 "

Therefore from the beginning of the	
Divided Kingdom to the end of the	
Jewish Kingdom was	... 392 "
Take this from	... 420 "
And you have	... 28 "

into the reign of Solomon, that is since he reigned 40 years, back to the twelfth year of his reign, which was the year after the temple was completed. But by the chronology given in the paper there is no room for the 420 years, they are made to begin ere the temple's foundations were laid. Yet surely during the most God-fearing seven years of Israel's history while the temple was being built the sabbatic year could not have failed of observance.

Lastly, I find by reckoning back to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan, that the twelfth year of Solomon was itself a sabbatic year. Thus:—

* Compare Zech. viii, 5, with Ezra vi, 16.

	Years.	Months.	Days.
From the Exodus to the laying of the Temple's foundation in the fourth year and second month of Solomon was	479	2	23
Thence to its Dedication... ..	7	6	7
In his eleventh year	486	8	0
Subtract for the Wanderings	40		
	7)446		
		63·5	

The previous year was thus a fifth and this one was a sixth after a sabbatic year. Therefore the next year or the twelfth year of Solomon was itself a sabbatic year.

Thus admirably does the Scripture history agree with itself in its statement of comprehensive epochs, and since as yet we cannot prove that the Assyrian history does so, let us wait for further discoveries in that field. Meanwhile we have a clear agreement in the order of events between the secular history and the sacred, and many names and transactions that are recorded in both.

The AUTHOR.—I am going to read a very short postscript to my paper presently, and that draws me into a great difficulty in regard to answering anything that has been said in the way of discussion.

What Dr. Pinches said with regard to the name Dadidri I was familiar with before. I had read Dr. Pinches' statement of that written in his book recently published.*

With regard to what the Chairman said, I have fully entered into the consideration of this number of 390 years, but I wanted, if I could, to confine this paper within narrow limits, for I was sure if I went beyond those limits we should have more matter than we could deal with at one meeting, and for that reason I even cut out of the paper itself a discussion of the question of the reign of Hezekiah.

* Referred to above, p. 275.

POSTSCRIPT.—On reading this paper since it has been set up in type, it strikes me that it is too positive in its tone and may convey an impression that I mean it to be accepted as a final solution. This, however, is not the case. It is purely tentative, and since it was written I have met with additional reasons for regarding it in this light. In February I received an inquiry from Mr. C. Crain, of Boston, Mass., U.S.A., as to the progress of my investigation in Hebrew Chronology, and in reply to my answer he sent me a *précis* of his own scheme of this period, which struck me so strongly by its ingenuity and careful research, that I asked him to draw up a short statement of his views in order that I might lay it before you in the discussion on this paper as an alternative to my own; this in a letter dated 31st March he promised to send, but it has not yet reached me. His paper was published in *The Shepherd's Voice* during the year 1895, but until the correspondence now mentioned I had never heard of that publication or of Mr. Crain.

His scheme appears to be *founded* on the cross references in the books of Kings between the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, he admits coregnancies of various kings, and there may be some new difficulties as to age of fatherhood for two of the kings of Judah, but he retains *every Scriptural date* except the 27 years in 2 Kings xv, 1; and all the Assyrian dates *without any gap in the eponym lists*. If the date of Shishak can be lowered to 940, or thereabouts (and this I find on careful revision of my Egyptian scheme is perfectly feasible) and the coregnancies admitted (on which question I am at present engaged), I shall withdraw my own scheme in favour of Mr. Crain's. Nevertheless I shall not in any case regret having proposed it; for, if Mr. Crain proves to be right, the vindication of the Scriptural dates will be absolutely complete, and I need hardly say that no one will be more pleased than myself if my paper should prove to be merely a vantage ground from which the "Shepherd's Voice" shall be more clearly heard proclaiming the perfect consistency and historical accuracy of the Book of Kings. I append a tabular view of Mr. Crain's remarkable scheme condensed by me from the elaborate table which I received from him in March.

F. G. FLEAY.

HEBREW CHRONOLOGY SYNCHRONIZED WITH ASSYRIAN.

Judah.		B.C.	Israel.		
1 Rehoboam	...	930	1 Jeroboam
5 (Shishak)	...	926
17	914
1 Abijah	913	18
3 ...	1 Asa ...	911	20
...	2 ...	910	...	1 Nadab	...
...	3 ...	909	22 ...	2 ...	1 Baasha
...	15 (Zorah)...	897
...	26 ...	886	1 Elah	24 ...
...	27 ...	885	2 ...	Zimri	1 Omri.
...	...	881	Tibni dies
...	...	874	1 Ahab	12 ...
1 Jehoshaphat	41 ...	871	4
17 ...	1 Jehoram (a)	855	...	1 Ahaziah	...
18	854	21 (Qarqar)	2 (6 Shal.)	1 Joram.
22 ...	1 Jehoram (b)	850	5 ...
25	847
Ahaziah...	8 ...	843	12 ...
...	1 Athaliah	842	1 Jehu ...	tribute	18 Shalmaneser.
1 Jehoash...	7 ...	836	7
...	...	815	28
23	814	1 Jehoahaz
...	...	803	12 ...	tribute	9 R. nirari.
37	800	15 ...	1 Joash	...
38 ...	1 Amaziah	799	16 ...	2
...	...	798	17
40	797
...	...	788	1 Jeroboam (a)	13
1 Uzziah (a)	15 ...	785	1 Jeroboam (b)	16
14 ... (b)	28 (flees) ...	772	17
...	29 ...	771
...	...	750	1 Pekah (a).
...	1 Jotham...	749	2 ...
38	748	41 ...	Zachariah	...
39	747	Shallum	1 Menahem	...
...	9 J. = 1 Ahaz (a)	741
...	...	738	7 Tiglath P.	10 (tribute)	...
50	736	1 Pekahah
...	...	735	2

Judah.		B.C.	Israel.		
52	... 16 J. = 8 A. (a) = 1 A.(b)	734	17 = 1 (b).
...	...	731	20 ...
...	20 J. = 12 A. (a)	730	1 Hoshea
...	...	728	3
1 Hezekiah	...	727
...	16 A. (a)	726
6	...	722	9 ...	Samaria	taken.

The following communication has been received from the Rev. R. C. OULTON, B.D., Rector of Glynn, co. Antrim:—

I have read with great interest and pleasure Mr. Fleay's valuable paper on the above subject. His method of reconciling the discrepancies between certain statements in Kings and the researches of Assyriologists, as well as other passages in the sacred historical writings, seems to me ingenious, and, to a considerable extent, well grounded. May I be permitted to offer some criticism on his treatment of 2 Kings xv, 30? This thirtieth verse he gives up as untenable for the following reasons:—1st. "Hoshea did not obtain the throne by an independent conspiracy, but was appointed by Tiglath, who had smitten Pekah," according to Assyrian annals. 2nd. "The twentieth year of Jotham is an impossible date; for Jotham reigned only 16 years." In expressing my opinion that the rejection of the verse in question is too drastic a method, I would tentatively suggest another way of meeting the difficulty.

In the first place, it does not appear to me that the verse necessarily implies that Hoshea got possession of the throne "by an independent conspiracy." After the murder of Pekah, there may have been an interregnum for some years (as the country was probably in a disturbed state) until he was recognised as reigning king by Tiglath Pileser.

Secondly, the date given namely, the twentieth year of Jotham, may fairly be taken to apply to the time not when Hoshea came to the throne, but rather to the time of the conspiracy.

Thirdly, the contradiction between twenty and sixteen years as the period of the reign of Jotham may be accounted for in the

following way :—There may have been some uncertainty as to the exact duration of this monarch's reign owing to the want of agreement as to the precise time, in the original Jewish Chronicles, from which the writers of the Book of Kings copied. There are evidently marks of a different hand in verses 32, 33, and by no means have we a right to assume that the same writer penned all the historic events recorded in the fifteenth chapter.

One general remark I would make, and it is this—that we ought not to take it for granted that where there is a discrepancy between the Assyrian monuments and the Jewish records, that the former are *invariably* accurate.