

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 5—January, 1891.

I.

RECENT DOGMATIC THOUGHT AMONG THE PROTESTANTS IN AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.*

WE are not so fortunate as to be able to avail ourselves of sources lying ready at hand to obtain a correct impression of the dogmatic tendency or tendencies which have prevailed among the Protestants of Austria-Hungary since the middle of this century. Besides some scattered articles in brochures and church papers, as, for example, in Schenkel's *Allgemeine kirchliche Zeitschrift*,† there exists no treatment of the subject of any kind which can be called in any way comprehensive or exhaustive. Moreover, the isolated studies which exist, are written from very diverse standpoints, and therefore make no uniform impression. We shall endeavor to give the American theological public some information concerning the subject indicated in the title, drawn partly from experience and partly from periodicals and brochures of all kinds. If the reader will glance at a map of Austria-Hungary, he will perceive a very extensive tract. From the Russian-Turkish boundary to the Tyrol, from the northernmost part of Bohemia to the Adriatic sea, stretches the territory, and Protestant congregations are found everywhere in it. In some places they stand forth as mere ruins of former greatness and glory, as in the German-Slavic countries; in others they are more compact, as in Hungary, along the Theiss and around Debreczin.

In Hungary the gospel has never had to submit to be entirely

* [For the translation of Dr. Böhl's paper our readers are indebted to the competent hand of the Rev. Charles S. Barrett, M.A., of Baltimore, Md.—
EDITORS.]

† See for the year 1863, 4 Heft.

VII.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE DIVIDED KINGDOM.

DURING the period under review, two events proved peculiar interruptions. Ahaziah of Judah and Jehoram of Israel were overthrown virtually on the same day: accordingly with their immediate successors the two kingdoms started together anew and with usurpers on the throne. Later the fall of Samaria terminated the existence of the northern realm, left Judah alone, and thereby henceforth abolished that characteristic of the chronology, the interlacing synchronisms. These two events evidently determine three historical epochs, viz.: 1. From the disruption of the kingdom to Jehu's usurpation; 2. From Jehu's accession to the fall of Samaria; and, 3. From the fall of Samaria to the exile. In these three historical divisions the biblical chronology of the period may be most conveniently studied; for the sections are measured both by Hebrew and gentile data, so that a double test of accuracy is afforded. The Hebrew figures should assign equal duration to corresponding sections of the neighboring kingdom's history, and bring them within the same chronological limits as does established extra-biblical chronology. In these three divisions, then, the actual condition of the Hebrew text is to be investigated, synchronisms exhibited, any point of divergence discovered, any corruptions located.

Four preliminary remarks are in place.

1. Over against chronological systems like those of Ussher and Hales, the existence of the interregna assumed in order to harmonize the biblical statements has been denied. And rightly. That interregna did not exist is rendered probable by the silence of the Hebrew narrative in reference thereto, and by the continuity of the history; and especially in the case of Pekah and Hoshea, that no interregna intervened between them is proved by the Assyrian records, for Tiglath-pileser says: "Pekah I killed, and appointed Hoshea to be king over them." Periods of anarchy did not occur.

2. The legitimacy of the assumption of co-reigns has likewise been denied. This denial, unlike the former, does not stand. The existence of co-reigns in neighboring monarchies was common. In Assyrian history Esarhaddon on the eve of departure for an Egyptian campaign, caused Asurbanipal, his son, to be proclaimed and the new king "after that exercised rule." In Egyptian history co-reigns were

of common occurrence. Nor were they wanting in Israel. David, in his feebleness and in view of approaching death, caused Solomon to be proclaimed king and transferred the government to him (1 Kg. i. 34, 35, 46-48, 50-53, also Josephus Ant. vii. xiv. 10 and xv. 1). Furthermore it is stated that when Uzziah was smitten with leprosy, he retired to a separate residence while Jotham "was over the house, judging the people of the land;" in other words, performing the judicial functions of royalty. It is thus a fact that in Israel, as in the kingdoms on either side, regencies were created as occasion required.

3. The third remark concerns modes of reckoning reigns. The Hebrews, like the Assyrians, began the year in the spring with the month Nisan. That new year's day coincided in the calendars of the two peoples is, however, uncertain; for it is not known that both nations were governed by the same law in determining the insertion of intercalary months to restore conformity between the lunar year, which was in vogue, and the solar seasons. Again, the biblical chronological data, rest ultimately on entries made in the annals by many different men during the course of centuries. Now the Assyrian canon and dated tablets reveal the fact that different men often employed different methods of computation. According to the mode of reckoning followed by the framer of Canon ii, Sennacherib's first year was his accession year, though he did not ascend the throne until the fifth month; according to the method used by the scribe who prepared Canon iv, Sennacherib's first year was the first civil twelve-month which followed the coronation, although he had already been king for seven months: in other words, the one Assyrian writer called 705, the other 704, Sennacherib's first year. And this variety of method was general; for from the dates on tablets it appears that while some referred to the year 700 as Sennacherib's sixth year (K. 2856, cp. K. 2670), others reckoned it as his fifth (K. 75 and Smith, *Epon. Canon*, p. 88, under the year 704). It need cause no surprise therefore, should chronological notices from different Hebrew hands likewise show different methods of reckoning the regnal years of the same monarch: much less if the accession year of one king is invariably reckoned as first regnal year by the scribes of his reign whose notices are extant; while of another king not the accession year, but the civil year following coronation is called the first. The absence of a fixed plan pursued by the annalists from year to year during the centuries under consideration contributes largely to the difficulties of arranging the data.

4. The fourth and last general remark concerns the condition of the text. It is well known that biblical numbers have suffered in transmission. Those which relate to the period of the divided kingdom have not escaped corruption; *e. g.*, although, according to the context, Ahaziah's father and immediate predecessor on the throne was but forty years of age at death, yet he himself is stated in 2 Chron. xxii. 2 to have been "forty-and-two years old when he began to reign." In 2 Kg. viii. 26 his age at accession is rightly given as two-

and-twenty. Again Jehoiachin, who was eighteen years old when he was made king (2 Kg. xxiv. 8), is by a slip of the pen in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9 stated to have been eight. It is well to consider the age of twenty-five years assigned to Hezekiah at his accession as likewise erroneous, since it involves extreme youthfulness in Ahaz at the time of his son's birth. In the chronological scheme which is about to be presented, the assumption of corrupt numbers is not a feature: nevertheless, it is freely granted that, in addition to the cases cited, others may exist, though their detection, with the light at present obtainable, is generally extremely difficult.

I. FROM THE DISRUPTION TO JEHU.

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------|------------------|----|-----------------|------------------------------|
| 1 K. 14 : 21 | Rehoboam | 1 | 931 | 1 | Jeroboam | 1 K. 14 : 20 |
| | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| 2 C. 11 : 17 | Three yrs. godliness | 3 | | 3 | | |
| | | 4 | | 4 | | |
| 1 K. 14 : 25 | Shishak's invasion. | 5 | | 5 | | |
| | | 6 | | 6 | | |
| | | 17 | 915 | 17 | | |
| 1 K. 15 : 1-2 } 2 C 13 : 1-2 } | Abijam | 1..... | | 18 | | |
| | | 2 | | 19 | | |
| | | 3..... | | 20 | | |
| 1 K. 15 9-10 | Asa Ascends throne. 1st regnal year. | 1 | | 21 | | |
| | | 2..... | 1 ² 2 | | Nadab | 1 K. 15 : 25. |
| 2 C. 14 : 1 | Land quiet ten years. | 3..... | 2.1 | | Baasha | 1 K. 15 : 28-33 |
| | | 4 | | 2 | | |
| | | 10 | 902 | 8 | | |
| | | 11 | | 9 | | |
| 2 C. 14 : 9-15 | War with Zerah bet. 11 and 14. | 12 | | 10 | | |
| | | 13 | | 11 | | |
| | | 14 | | 12 | | |
| | | 15 | | 13 | | |
| 2 C. 15 : 10 | Reformation. | 16 | | 14 | | |
| 2 C. 15 : 19 ; } 16 : 1-2 } | Buys aid of Benhadah against Baasha. | 16 | | 14 | | |
| | | 25 | 887 | 23 | | |
| | | 26..... | 1 ² 4 | | Elah | 1 K. 16 : 8. |
| | | 27..... | 2.1 | | Zimri (7 ds.) | 1 K. 16 : 10-15 |
| | | 28 | | 2 | Omri | 1 K. 16 : 16-23 |
| | | 29 | | 3 | | |
| | | 30 | | 4 | | |
| | | 31..... | | 5 | | |
| | | 36 | 876 | 10 | | |
| LXX. 1 K. } 16 : 28 } | Jehoshaphat assoc. | 1..... | | 11 | | |
| | | 2..38..... | 1.2.1 | | Ahab | LXX. 1 K. 16 : 29 Heb. do |
| 2 C. 16 : 12 | Asa diseased. | 3 | 39 | 2 | | |
| | | 4 | 40 | 3 | | |
| 1 K. 22 : 41-42 | Jehoshaphat | 5 | 41..... | 4 | | |
| | 1st year of sole reign. | 1 | 870 | 5 | | |
| | | 2 | | 6 | | |
| | | 3 | | 7 | | |
| 2 K. 8 : 25-26 } 2 C. 22 : 1 } | Marries his first-born, Jehoram, to daughter of Ahab. | 4 | | 8 | | |
| | | 5 | | 9 | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|----|----------|--------|-----------------------------|
| | | 15 | 856 | 19 | |
| | | 16 | | 20 | |
| | Jehoram assoc. | 1 | 17.....1 | 21 | Ahaziah 1 K. 22 : 51 |
| | | 2 | 18.....2 | 1 2 2 | Jehoram 2 K. 1 : 17 |
| | | 3 | 19 | 2 | 2 K. 3 : 1 |
| | | 4 | 20 | 3 | |
| | | 5 | 21 | 4 | |
| 2 K. 8 : 16-17 | Jehoram sole king. | 1 | | 5 | |
| | | | | 6 | 10 |
| 2 K. 9 : 29 | | |7 | | 11 |
| 2 K. 8 : 25-26 | Ahaziah king. | 1 |8 | 42..12 | 1 Jehu |

Where Josephus has recorded chronological data, as is generally the case, he has the same figures as the Hebrew, either expressly or by implication; except that for "the thirty and first year of Asa" he has "the thirtieth," probably through accidental omission of the unit.

Certain questions require discussion concerning the data in themselves, in reference to the domestic history of the kingdoms, and in relation to foreign records. They will be taken up as nearly as possible in order.

To Shishak there are two references in the Old Testament. Jeroboam fled to him for refuge from Solomon, and he invaded Judah in the days of Rehoboam. The flight of Jeroboam occurred some time after the twenty-fourth year of Solomon (1 Kg. vi. 38; vii. 1; ix: 10 and 24; xi. 27) and the invasion of Judah in the fifth year of Rehoboam: accordingly, the longest time demanded by the biblical data for the reign of Shishak is twenty-one years, though a much shorter duration would suffice. This demand is met by the Egyptian monuments, for they mention the twenty-first year of his reign.

Zerah the Cushite, who warred with Asa, is generally identified with Osorkon. As nearly as can at present be determined, it would appear from the figures of Manetho compared with the monumental remains that Osorkon II, began to reign seventeen years after Shishak's demise and occupied the throne for twenty-three years; accordingly he was contemporary with Asa from long before until long after the time of the recorded war.

"There was no war until the five-and-thirtieth year of the reign of Asa, and in the six-and-thirtieth year of the reign of Asa, Baasha, king of Israel, came up against Judah" (2 Chron. xv. 19; xvi. 1). But Baasha died in the twenty-sixth year of Asa. The older commentators secured harmony by explaining the date as reckoned not from the beginning of Asa's own reign, but from the commencement of the kingdom of Judah. Accordingly the invasion occurred in Asa's sixteenth regnal year. Modern interpreters, on the other hand, generally regard the text as corrupt and read fifteen or twenty-five and sixteen or twenty-six for thirty-five and thirty-six respectively. And well: for the record is found in Chronicles, a book less carefully transmitted than Kings; and the phrase in question elsewhere always signifies the

regnal years of the reigning sovereign, and recurs twice with reference to Asa, each time undoubtedly in the sense of regnal years (xv. 10 and xvi. 12). The corruption is similar to, though not as great as, that in chapter iii. 15, where thirty-five should be eighteen (1 Kg. vii. 15; 2 Kg. xxv. 17; Jer. lii. 21), or like the confusion of fifty and twenty which occurs in 2 Chron. viii. 18 or 1 Kg. ix. 28.

When the news of Zimri's murder of the king and usurpation of the crown reached the army, the soldiers at once proclaimed their general, Omri, king of Israel (1 Kg. xvi. 16). He forthwith marched against Tirzah, the capital fell and the usurper Zimri firing the palaces perished in the flames. "Then were the people of Israel divided into two parts;" half following Tibni to make him king, and half adhering to Omri. After five years of hostility the followers of Omri prevailed, the rival Tibni died and Omri reigned in undisputed authority. "In the thirty-and-first year of Asa began Omri to reign over Israel, twelve years; six years reigned he in Tirzah" and then built Samaria (1 Kg. xvi. 21-23). By comparison of vs. 15, 23 and 29, it becomes evident that the statement regarding Omri "he began to reign" (in Hebrew simply "he reigned") refers, not to the time of his proclamation by the soldiery and his assumption of the royal title (though the twelve years of his reign are counted from this event), but to his attainment of sole, undisputed authority by the overthrow of his rival five years later.

In reference to the accessions of Jehoshaphat and Ahab, the Greek and Hebrew text represent different historical standpoints. They agree as to the length of the respective reigns; but the synchronisms differ not only in the numbers, but also as to contemporary sovereigns and place in the narrative. The divergence finds its explanation in the regency of Jehoshaphat with his father Asa. The Hebrew text, while including the years of his regency in his reign, dates, as in the case of his contemporary Omri, the commencement of his rule from the time he assumed sole control of the government. The Septuagint, however, mentions two beginnings for his reign: dating first from the assumption of the regency, relating this event in its historical place and synchronizing the Israelitish reigns therewith; and then, also in its historical place and with proper synchronisms, recording his assumption of rule in the year when, as it appears, his father died and left him alone on the throne. The length of his reign was computed, analogously to that of David's in 2 Sam. v. 4, 5, thus: "He reigned twenty-and-five years;" four years and a few months reigned he with Asa his father, and twenty-and-one years alone.

Jehoshaphat, in his turn, associated his eldest son Jehoram with him as regent. This appears from a comparison of 2 Kg. i. 17 with iii. 1. It occurred just before Jehoshaphat made that visit to Samaria, during which he was persuaded by Ahab to join in the disastrous undertaking against Ramoth-gilead (1 Kg. xxii. 2; 2 Chron. xviii. 2). Later, following the example of David, Jehoshaphat transferred the

kingdom to the regent. The record is: "In the fifth year of Joram the son of Ahab, king of Israel, Jehoshaphat being then king of Judah, Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, began to reign" (2 Kg. viii. 16). Objection has been taken to the phrase "Jehoshaphat being then king of Judah;" but the grammatical correctness of the Hebrew is established by such passages as 2 Kg. xxv. 4, "The Chaldeans being then against the city round about," and Gen. vii. 6 and ix. 23. Five years after associating his son with him on the throne, perhaps at the opening of the new year, "Jehoshaphat gave up the reins of government entirely to him" (Keil), as did David, but a few months before his death: thus "in the fifth year of Joram the son of Ahab, while Jehoshaphat was king of Judah, Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat began to reign." The reference in 2 Chron. xxi. 3 may be to the bestowal of either the regency or the sole rule.

Jehoram of Judah was succeeded by his son Ahaziah, the last Judean king of this period. A terrible sickness of two years' duration (2 Chron. xxi. 19) having befallen the father, whereby he was incapacitated for the active duties of government, he was obliged to make Ahaziah regent. This was in his seventh year, *i. e.*, the eleventh of Joram of Israel (2 Kg. ix. 29). When in his eighth year he succumbed to the disease, his son and regent ruled alone, *i. e.*, in the twelfth year of Joram of Israel (2 Kg. viii. 25). These entries in the annals are dated from different standpoints; the one from the commencement of the regency, the other from the beginning of the sole reign.

The examination of the Israelitish history must now be resumed. A regency of Ahaziah of Israel with his father Ahab is not only involved in the figures, but is required by the most natural exegesis and is historically probable. The crowded events of this disturbed period occurred in the following order:

856 B. C. Israel and Syria at peace for three years (1 Kg. xxii. 1), *i. e.*, during their alliance against Shalmaneser.

854. Ahab, leaving his kingdom in his twenty-first year and marching with his Syrian allies to oppose the Assyrian advance, makes Ahaziah regent.

Battle of Karkar. Allies defeated.

853. Ahab plans with the help of Jehoshaphat to wrest Ramoth-gilead from the Syrians, now that Ben-hadad has been weakened by his defeat.

At the battle of Ramoth-gilead, which probably took place in early spring, "the time when kings go forth to war," Ahab is slain (1 Kg. xxii. 35), and Ahaziah thereby becomes sole king.

The discomfiture of Israel and Judah, and the death of Ahab are the signal to Moab to refuse the tribute of this year, the second of Ahaziah (*Ant.* ix. ii. 1) to Israel (2 Kg. i. 1).

Jehoshaphat returns to Jerusalem (say in May) and undertakes a religious reform of the people (2 Chron. xix. 1, *seq.*).

"After this" reform had begun (2 Chron. xx. 1), the Moabites in alliance with the Edomites, who had been persuaded to revolt, invade Judah. Jehoshaphat defeats the allies and reduces Edom to its former subjection. Time of peace ensues (2 Chron. xx. 30).

“After this” event (2 Chron. xx. 35), say in late autumn, during the period of peace, Jehoshaphat, who had been building ships at Ezion-geber, asks Ahaziah to take part in the venture. A prophet rebukes him and the ships are wrecked (2 Chron. xx. 37; 1 Kg. xxii. 48). He denies Ahaziah’s request to share in a new undertaking (1 Kg. xxii. 49).

Elijah succeeded by Elisha.

Ahaziah dies of injuries received from a fall and Jehoram succeeds him (2 Kg. i. 2-17), perhaps in December or January, thus ruling during the remaining three or four months of the year.

852 or later. Jehoram, desiring to render Moab again tributary, asks aid of his brother-in-law Jehoshaphat (2 Kg. iii. 7). The latter “probably wished to chastise the Moabites still further for their invasion of Judah” (Keil) and therefore, although he had been rebuked for allying himself with ungodly Ahab and Ahaziah, consents; for Jehoram had exhibited signs of godliness by a considerable reformation (2 Kg. iii. 2). For this alliance, Jehoshaphat is not rebuked and in it enjoys partial success.

With this result Assyrian chronology is in entire accord; as is exhibited by the following table, in which the statements of the Assyrian monuments are placed side by side with the Hebrew history.

856. Peace with Ben-hadad for three years (1 Kg. xx. 33, 34, and xxii. 1).

853. Ahab in war with the king of Syria, *i. e.*, Ben-hadad (Jos. *Ant.* viii. xv. 5), is slain at Ramoth-gilead. Ahaziah reigns alone. Elijah succeeded by Elisha, and Ahaziah by Jehoram.

852. War with Moab.

Ben-hadad wages predatory warfare with Israel for some time by means of marauding bands (2 Kg. vi. 8-23, before healing of Naaman, 2 Kg. v. 2).

850-49. (?) Marauding expeditions having ceased, Israel is apparently undisturbed for a time by Syria.

848-6. (?) Ben-hadad invades Israel with all his forces and beleaguers Samaria; but later abandons the siege (2 Kg. vi. 24, *seq.*).

854. Shalmaneser defeats [Bin]-addu-idri of Damascus and Ahab of Israel (Obelisk 54 *seq.*, Monolith, *i. e.*, iii. R. 7-8, Col. ii. 78 *seq.*).

850. Shalmaneser wars against Ben-hadad (Layard xv. 29-34).

849. Salmaneser wars with Ben-hadad (Obelisk 87 *seq.*).

846. Shalmaneser at war with Ben-hadad (Layard xvi. 43 *seq.*).

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 845-3. Ben-hadad murdered and succeeded by Hazael; if after the close of the seven years' famine, in 843 (2 Kg. viii. 15). | | 842. Shalmaneser at war with Hazael; and receives tribute from Jehu (III R. 5 No. 6, 40 seq., for Hazael: 60-65 for Jehu). |
| 842. Ahaziah and Jehoram against Hazael (2 Kg. viii. 28, 29). Jehu usurps the throne. | | |

For the statements of the Moabite stone relative to this period, see PAOS, Oct., 1890.

II. FROM JEHU'S ACCESSION TO THE FALL OF SAMARIA.

This chronological section and the preceding overlap. That, however, is contrary to history. As will be seen by a glance at the tabulated statement, Joash is chronologically the immediate successor of Ahaziah, suggesting perhaps that the usurpation of Athaliah was regarded as but an unpleasant episode of the reign of Joash. But of this anon.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|------------|--------|--|------------------|
| | Athaliah | 1 | 847 | 1 | Jehu | 2 K. 10 : 36 |
| | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| 2 K. 12 : 1 | Joash | 7 | 1 841..... | 7 | | |
| | | | 2 | 8 | | |
| | | | 3 | 9 | Shalmaneser at war with Hazael. | Obelisk 102 |
| | | | 20 | 26 | | |
| | | | 21..... | 27 | 1 Jehoahaz assoc. | Ant. ix. viii. 5 |
| | | | 22 | (28) 2 | Hazael against Israel. | 2 K. 10 : 32 |
| 2 K. 12 : 6 | Renewed attempt } to repair temple } | 23..... | | 3 | Jehoahaz alone. | 2 K. 13 : 1 |
| | | 24 | | 4 | | |
| 2 K. 12 : 17. | Hazael against Gath and Jerusalem. | | | | Hazael oppresses Israel. | 2 K. 13 : 3 |
| 2 C. 24 : 25 | Joash sorely dis'd. | 37..... | | 1 17 | Jehoash | 2 K. 13 : 10 |
| | Amaziah | 1 | | 2 | } [Bin-addu]-mari, king of Damascus, besieged by Ramman-nirari. Jehoash victorious over Ben-hadad. | |
| | | 2 | 803 | 3 | | |
| | Joash dies. | 3 (40) | | 4 | | |
| For date, Ant. ix. ix. 3 | Defeated and his capital taken by Jehoash. | 14 | 791 | 15 | Jeroboam ascends. | 2 K. 14 : 23. |
| | | 15..... | | 16 | 1st regnal year. | |
| | | 16 | | 1 | | |
| | | 17 | | 2 | | |
| 2 K. 14 : 19 | Conspired against. | 18 | | 3 | | |
| 2 K. 14 : 21 | Uzziah proclaimed by populace | 1 | | 4 | | |
| | | 2 | | 5 | | |
| 2 K. 14 : 17 | Amaziah survives Jeroboam 15 yrs. | | | | | |
| | | 10 | | 13 | | |
| 2 K. 14 : 19 | Amaziah slain and Uzziah supreme. | (29) 11..... | | 14 | | Ant. ix. x. 3 |
| | | 12 | | 15 | | |
| 2 K. 14 : 22 | Builds Elath after death of Amaziah. | | | | | |
| 2 K. 15 : 1 | In special sense "reigns." | | | 27 | | |
| | | 25 | | 28 | | |
| | | 36 | | 39 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----|----------|-----------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2 K. 15 : 5 | Becomes leprous. | 37 | 750 | 40 | Earthquake hereabouts. | | |
| 2 K. 15 : 32, 33 | Jotham | 1 | 38 | }41 | } Contemporary with 1 C. 5 : 17 Jotham. | | |
| | | 2 | (39) | | | Zachariah | 2 K. 15 : 8 |
| | | | | | | Shallum | 2 K. 15 : 13 |
| | | 3 | | 1 | } ascends. 2 K. 15 : 17 1st regnal year. | | |
| | | 4 | | 2 | | | |
| | | 5 | 745 | 3 | Pul—i. e., Tiglath- pileser — ascends throne of Assyria. | | |
| | Ahaz associated. | 9 | | 7 | | | |
| | | 10 | 740 | 8 | | | |
| | | 11 | | 9 | | | |
| | | 12 | | 10 | Pays tribute to Pul. | | |
| | | 13 | (50) | 1 | Pekahiah | 2 K. 15 : 23 | |
| | | 14 | | 2 | | | |
| 2 K. 15 : 32 | Uzziah dies and Jo- tham succeeds. | 15 | (52) | 1 | Pekah | 2 K. 15 : 27 | |
| 2 K. 16 : 1, 2 | Ahaz alone. | 8 | }2 | | | | |
| | | 9 | | 733 | | | |
| | | 10 | | | | | |
| | | 11 | | | Ahaz mentioned by Tiglath-pileser. | | |
| | | 12 | (20) | 730 | 1 | Hoshea | 2 K. 15 : 30 2 K. 17 : 1 |
| | | 13 | | | 2 | | |
| 2 K. 18 : 1, 2 | Hezekiah as- cends | 14 | | | 3 | | |
| Ant. ix. xiii. 1 | 1st regnal year. | 15 | 1 | | 4 | | |
| | Ahaz dies. | 16 | 2 | | 5 | | |
| | | | 3 | | 6 | | |
| 2 K. 18 : 9. } | | | 4 | | 7 | | |
| Ant. ix. xiv. 1 } | | | 5 | | 8 | | |
| 2 K. 18 : 10 | | 6 | 722 | 9 | | Fall of Samaria | |

The variants of Josephus are twenty-seven years instead of twenty-eight for the length of Jehu's reign, and forty instead of forty-one for that of Jeroboam. Both are corruptions, and should be twenty-eight and forty-one as in the Hebrew, for Josephus' own summation of the regnal years of the kings of this period exceeds by two years the result of adding together the figures as at present found in the text. The present text synchronizes the ninth year of Hoshea with the seventh of Hezekiah; which is proven by the context to be also corrupt, for there it is stated that 1st Hezekiah = 4th Hoshea. The remaining variants are twenty-first for twenty-third year of Joash, fourteenth for twenty-seventh of Jeroboam, fourth for third of Hoshea, and the additional datum fourteenth Amaziah. These are, however, perhaps all in accord with the Hebrew. As appears from harmonious variants and additions, both in Josephus and the Septuagint, to the data of the three chronological epochs under consideration, a fuller history of the kingdoms—probably the books to which the Old Testament writers refer their readers for further details—was extant than the brief compendiums handed down to us. In regard to Josephus' methods, it should be observed that he neither had a chronological scheme for ante-Babylonian times nor attempted a harmonistic: in order to obtain the length of any given period, he simply added together the regnal years of the included kings, although by so doing he obtained, on different occasions, different duration for the same absolute time; *e. g.*, for the duration of the monarchy, according as he sums up the reigns of the southern or northern kings.

Jehoahaz ascended the throne, according to the Hebrew record, in the twenty-third, according to Josephus in the twenty-first year of

Joash. Josephus has taken from the ancient records the date of Jehoahaz' association with his father, whereas the Old Testament writer has extracted the date when the sole reign began. The regency was probably necessitated by the advanced age of Jehu, who had reached man's estate and attained prominent military position in the days of Ahab, forty odd years previously (2 Kg. ix. 25); and by the old king's loss of the impetuous energy and martial ability of his younger days, so distressingly seen in his allowing the region east of the Jordan to be wrested from him by Hazael (2 Kg. x. 32, 33).

Joash, distressed by a complication of diseases, took up his residence in the house of Millo, and, in the thirty-eighth year of his reign relegated the affairs of state to his son Amaziah (2 Chron. xxiv. 25; 2 Kg. xii. 20). He himself lingered on for two years longer.

The Assyrian king Ramman-nirari besieged Mari, king of Damascus, and subjugated the land of Omri, *i. e.*, Israel. These events probably occurred in the year 803, when an expedition of Ramman-nirari is reported "to the sea-coast," a common designation for the region bordering on the Mediterranean. Mari is a common noun, meaning lord (K.A.T., 2te Aufl., S. 212); and is not suitable as the proper name of a person. Ben-hadad, too, is not the name of a person, but of a deity. It occurs in such proper names as Bin-addu-natanu and Bin-addu-amara (PSBA, Feb., 1883). The full name of the great Ben-hadad of the Old Testament, ally and foe of Ahab, was Bin-addu-idri, *i. e.*, "The god Ben-hadad is my help:" a name which like many another was abbreviated; apocopated by the Assyrians, curtailed by the Hebrews. It is probable that the Ben-hadad, who was contemporary with Jehoahaz and Jehoash (2 Kg. xiii. 3, 25), was the Mari of the inscription; and that his full name was Bin-addu-mari', *i. e.*, "God Ben-hadad is lord."

The defeat of Amaziah took place in his fourteenth year (*Ant.* ix. ix. 3); and he survived his conqueror fifteen years. The populace rejected Amaziah, shortly after his fall it would seem, and proclaimed a successor to him; though the scribes continued to record his regnal years as long as he lived. The dates of his flight to Lachish and his murder there cannot be determined from the narrative. His troubles find a parallel in those of Henry VI of England, who for the last ten years of his life contended for his crown, was repeatedly acknowledged and rejected as king by parliament, and finally mysteriously died; but the last decade of his reign was included in the reign of his successful rival Edward.

Uzziah, son and successor of Amaziah, was proclaimed king by the people during the life-time of his father. This is not only involved in the chronological data, but is evident from the statement that he built Elath, "after that the king slept with his fathers;" words which otherwise have no significance. Josephus, dating from the attainment of sole headship at the death of Amaziah, states that "Uzziah . . . began to reign over the two tribes in the fourteenth year of the reign of

Jeroboam." The writer of Kings (2 Kg. xv. 1) gives the date as the twenty-seventh of Jeroboam. "This is most easily explained," says Kleinert (Riehm, *Handwörterbuch*, Art. Uzziah), "by the assumption that in this year the kingdom of Judah had regained the full sovereignty;" freeing itself from vassalage to Jeroboam, in which it had been held since the overthrow of Amaziah, the capture and dismantlement of Jerusalem, and the enforcement of hostages. The recovery of independence by Judah is a first symptom of the waning power of Jeroboam.

When Uzziah, by reason of his leprosy, was to all intents and purposes dead, Jotham assumed the government (2 Kg. xv. 5). He was for some ten months the royal contemporary of Jeroboam (1 Chron. v. 17). Further evidence of this partial contemporaneity of the reigns of Jotham and Jeroboam exists. Josephus describes in detail an earthquake which he says occurred coincidentally with Uzziah's becoming leprous. The minuteness of his description implies that he has authority for his account: so that not only is the actual occurrence of the earthquake probable, but also its occurrence sufficiently near the appearance of the leprosy in Uzziah to have become connected therewith in popular estimation. Now a notable earthquake did occur in the days of Uzziah and Jeroboam (Amos i. 1; Zech. xiv. 5). If this is one and the same with that mentioned by Josephus, the leprosy seized Uzziah and Jotham succeeded him as regent during the reign of Jeroboam.

In connection with the proximity of Uzziah's death to the attainment of authority by Ahaz, it is worthy of notice—whatever importance be attached to it—that Isaiah's vision dated in the death-year of Uzziah (chap. vi) is followed immediately by prophecies to Ahaz (chap. vii).

In the case of Menahem, as in that of Sennacherib, the first six or seven months of the reign were reckoned merely as the accession year; while the civil twelvemonth that followed was counted the first regnal year.

With Jotham, Hoshea is connected by a strange synchronism; "Hoshea . . . reigned . . . in the twentieth year of Jotham" (2 Kg. xv. 30). Despite its strangeness, however, this synchronism brings the preceding data into harmony with the Assyrian canon; introducing within the limits of the reign of Tiglath-pileser, who occupied the Assyrian throne from 745 to 727 B. C., his reception of tribute from Menahem in 738 and his connivance in the murder of Pekah by Hoshea. Nevertheless there are grave difficulties involved. By the Hebrew and Assyrian measurements, only six years intervened between Pekahiah and Hoshea to be occupied by the reign of Pekah; yet the Hebrew record assigns twenty years to that reign and refers synchronistically to the seventeenth year thereof. The knot may be cut and the text declared to be erroneous in these two notices. The error perhaps originated with some scribe who observed that whereas Jotham

began to reign in Pekah's second year and reigned sixteen years, his successor Ahaz was said to have begun in Pekah's second. Perceiving the apparent contradiction and surmising an error, he calculated—and from his understanding of the data correctly calculated—that Ahaz began to reign in the seventeenth year of Pekah. This involved a reign of twenty years for Pekah, and these two alterations were accordingly made in the text.

But cannot the apparently contradictory data be reconciled without the assumption of an error? May not Pekah have reigned for awhile as a rival to the king of Samaria, as some have suggested? The theory must take the following form to meet the requirements of the case. From the facts that at Jeroboam's death powerful factions contended for the crown, that Menahem down to the very end of his reign felt that his throne was weakened by opposition of some kind not named, that the prophets describe the period as one of lawlessness, and that Pekah had the assistance of fifty Gileadites, it would be inferred that in the last days of Jeroboam, *i. e.*, in 750, after the growing weakness of this king had been manifested by Judah's recovery of independence under Uzziah, Pekah set up rival authority in northern Gilead and Galilee and maintained his position during the succeeding disturbed years until at length the rule of Menahem was established over this region by Pul; who as is well-known in or before 738 B. C. subjugated Damascus, Hamath and Tyre, entered northern Israel, and for large money and the acknowledgment of Assyrian suzerainty confirmed the kingdom in Menahem's hand. Then Pekah, like Abner, abandoned opposition and professed loyalty. As Abner, who at the head of the Ten Tribes had waged war against David and maintained the division in the kingdom for seven years, was after his desertion of the cause of Saul made by David commander-in-chief of the armies of united Israel; so Pekah was given by Menahem a high confidential and military position in the hope thereby better to secure his allegiance and powerful influence. The expectation was not realized; in two years, Menahem having in the meanwhile died and the Assyrian king not having reappeared, Pekah aided by his Gileadite adherents, and perhaps backed by the alliance with Rezin, slew the son and successor of Menahem and ascended the throne, no longer as a rival king, but as monarch of the northern realm. Thus, in the fifty-second year of Uzziah, Pekah ruled over Israel in Samaria—twenty years ruled he; and, while some spoke of 734 as his second year, he himself preferred, rightly enough, to have 749 reckoned as his second and 734 as his seventeenth regnal year; as they indeed were. Of course, this is conjecture. It is suggested because a rival reign would remove a difficulty which else appears to be a textual corruption.

Ahaz was associated with his father in the latter's ninth year. This is involved in the two synchronisms, Hoshea 1 = 12 Ahaz and 20 Jotham. And from the statement that he reigned sixteen years and that accession of Hezekiah = Hoshea 3, it follows that during the last

two years of his life his son was associated with him; and if so, then it is evident from the history of the times that he was obliged to surrender the government entirely into the hands of this son. Against a regency might be urged the words of the priests spoken in Hezekiah's first year, "We have prepared and sanctified the vessels which King Ahaz in his reign in his transgression did cast away" (2 Chron. xxix. 19); as though they implied that Ahaz was dead. But they may equally well refer to the time of Ahaz' active rule and authority, before he was compelled to abandon all participation in the government. Though alive and bearing the title of king, he no longer exercised sway. That he had been visited by some divine judgment [or what was so understood by the people] is argued by Neteler from the facts that Ahaz "was not buried in the royal sepulchre;" and that Hezekiah, as it were awe-stricken, "at the very beginning of his reign called a meeting of the priests and Levites for the restoration of the temple and service." To this infliction—"mental derangement," suggests Alker—Neteler ascribes the incapacity of Ahaz for government and the necessity for the regency.

Tabulated comparison of the Hebrew and Assyrian records:

- | | | | |
|------|--|------|--|
| 738 | (as determined by the synchronism Hoshea 1 = Jotham 20), Menahem reigning, who sometime during his reign paid tribute to Pul, <i>i. e.</i> , Tiglath-pileser. | 738. | Tiglath-pileser receives tribute of Menahem of Samaria, and Rezin of Damascus. |
| 734. | During the reign of Jotham, Pekah and Rezin begin hostilities against Judah. Jotham succeeded by Ahaz, who buys the aid of Tiglath-pileser against Samaria, Damascus, Edom and Philistia. | 734. | Tiglath-pileser "marches to the land of Philistia," and captures Gaza. |
| | ep. 1 Chron. v. 26. | 733. | Tiglath-pileser "against Damascus;" having overrun "the land of Omri," probably on his way from Gaza to Damascus. |
| | | 732. | Tiglath-pileser still "against Damascus." Ravages sixteen districts thereof and slays Rezin. About this time he receives tribute from Joahaz of Judah, from Ammon, Moab and Edom, from Gaza and Askelon, etc. |
| 730. | Pekah murdered and succeeded by Hoshea. Hoshea pays tribute to the king of Assyria year by year. | 730. | (?) Through the instrumentality of Hoshea, Tiglath-pileser "slew Pekah, their king, and appointed Hoshea to rule over them," <i>i. e.</i> , the inhabitants of the land of Beth-Omri. |
| | | 727. | Death of Tiglath-pileser and accession of Shalmaneser. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 725. Hoshea pays homage to Shalmaneser. | 726. Shalmaneser "at home." |
| 724. Hoshea presently seeks an alliance with So of Egypt, and revolts from Assyria. | 725. Shalmaneser in foreign parts. |
| Shalmaneser takes him captive and begins the siege of Samaria. | 724. Shalmaneser in foreign parts. |
| 723. Samaria still besieged. | 723. Shalmaneser in foreign parts. |
| 722. Fall of Samaria. | 722. Fall of Samaria; and, almost contemporaneously therewith, death of Shalmaneser and accession of Sargon. |
| | 720. Sargon defeats Sibê of Egypt, <i>i. e.</i> , So. |

III. FROM THE FALL OF SAMARIA TO THE EXILE.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Hezekiah | 6.....722 | Fall of Samaria |
| | 7 | 721 1st year of Sargon. |
| | 13 | 715 Assyrian troops in Samaria and Arabia. Tribute from Egypt. |
| 2 K. 18 : 13 } 2 C. 32 : 1-8 } Is. 36 : 1 } | Sennacherib invades Judah. 14 | 714 (?) Assyrian troops "subjugated Judah" [perhaps under command of Sennacherib]. See this REVIEW, Vol. I, p. 100 <i>seq.</i> |
| 2 K. 20 : 6 } Is. 38 : 8 } | Hezekiah sick. 15 | 713 |
| 2 K. 20 : 12 Is. 39 : 1 | Receives embassy from Merodach-baladan about this date. 16 | 712 Judah tributary to Assyria.— <i>Octag. Cyl.</i> , 32-35. Merodach-baladan incites neighboring nations against Assyria. |
| Is. 20 : 1 | Sargon against Ashdod. 17 | 711 Sargon against Ashdod. |
| | 18 | 710 Sargon dethrones Merodach-baladan. |
| | 23 | 705 Sennacherib |
| 2 K. 18 : 14 <i>seq.</i> | Besieged by Sennacherib. 27 | 701 Against Hezekiah and Jerusa'm |
| | 28 | 700 |
| | 29 | 699 |
| | Dies and } Manasseh ascends throne } 1st year. } | 698 |
| 2 K. 21 : 1 | 1 | 697 |
| | 2 | 696 |
| 2 K. 19 : 37 | 18 | 680 Esarhaddon |
| | | Receives tribute from Mauasseh of Judah. |
| | 30 | 668 Asurbanipal |
| 2 C. 33 : 11 | 54 | 644 Receives tribute from Manasseh of Judah [about 644 (Schrader)]. |
| | 55 | 643 |
| | Dies and } Amon ascends throne. } 1st year. } | 642 |
| 2 K. 21 : 19 | 1 | 641 |
| | 2 | 640 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|----|-----|---------------------------------------|
| 2 K. 22 : 1 | Josiah | 1 | 639 | |
| | | 2 | 638 | |
| 2 C. 34 : 3 | Seeks Jehovah. | 8 | 632 | |
| 2 C. 34 : 3 | Begins to purge nation. | 12 | 628 | |
| Jer. 1 : 2 | Jeremiah begins. | 13 | 627 | |
| | | 14 | 626 | |
| | | 15 | 625 | Nebopolassar |
| Jer. 25 : 3 | 13th 13th Josiah to 4th Jehoiakim inc. = 23 years. | 30 | 610 | |
| | | 31 | 609 | Necho, King of Egypt. |
| 2 K. 23 : 29 | Slain by Necho. | | | |
| 2 K. 23 : 31 | Jehoahaz king 3 months. | 1 | 608 | |
| 2 K. 23 : 36 | Jehoiakim | 2 | 607 | |
| | | 3 | 606 | |
| Jer. 25 : 1 | He and Necho subjugated | 4 | 605 | Nebuchadnezzar ascends throne. |
| Ant. x. vi. 1 | by Nebuchadnezzar | 5 | 604 | 2d or 1st year. |
| Ant. x. x. 3 | Two years <i>after</i> the destruction of Egypt. | 6 | 603 | 2d year. |
| 2 K. 24 : 1 | Pays tribute to Neb. three years. | 8 | 601 | 4th year. |
| Ant. x. vi. 1 | | | | |
| | Yields to Neb. | 11 | | |
| 2 K. 24 : 8-12 | Jehoiachin three months. | | 598 | 8th or 7th year. |
| 2 C. 36 : 10 | Goes captive to Babylon towards close of year. | | | |
| 2 K. 24 : 18 | Zedekiah | 1 | 597 | |
| Jer. 51 : 59 | Visits Babylon. | 4 | 594 | Psammetick II. of Egypt. |
| 2 K. 25 : 1 | Jerusalem besieged. | 9 | 589 | Apries, King of Egypt. |
| Jer. 32 : 1 | | 10 | 588 | 18th or 17th of Neb. |
| 2 K. 25 : 8 | Temple burned in 5th month. | 11 | 587 | 19th or 18th of Neb. |
| Ant. x. viii. 5 | | | | |
| e. Apion I, 21 | | | | |
| Jer. 44 : 30 | Hophra— <i>i. e.</i> Apries—mentioned. | | | |
| Jer. 52 : 30 | Captives carried to Babylon 5th yr. <i>after</i> destruction of Jerusalem → 23d Neb. | | 582 | 23d of Neb. |
| Ant. x. ix. 7 | | | | |
| 2 K. 25 : 27 | 37th year of Jehoiachin's captivity. | | 562 | Evil-merodach ascends throne. |
| | | | 561 | 1st year. |
| | | | 539 | Cyrus ascends throne. |
| 2 C. 36 : 22 | Rebuilding of temple authorized. | | 538 | 1st year. |
| Ezra 3 : 8 | Rebuilding begun in 2d mo., having remained waste for 50 yrs.— <i>i. e.</i> , 49 yrs. and 9 mos. | | 537 | 2d year. |
| e. Apion I, 21 | | | | |

It is to be noted that whereas Ptolemy's canon ascribes thirteen years to the reign of Esarhaddon, the Babylonian chronicle states that he reigned twelve years, dying in his twelfth regnal year.

Of Hezekiah and Manasseh, the few months which elapsed between their last full regnal year and death, were apparently neglected in reporting the length of reign, and only the round numbers quoted.

If, as is probable but not quite certain, Nebuchadnezzar gained the victory at Carchemish before advancing against Jerusalem (Keil), Daniel reckoned the civil year which followed Jehoiakim's accession as the first year of that king; the same method which he employed in referring to the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign.

Two methods were in vogue for reckoning the regnal years of Nebuchadnezzar. In Ptolemy's canon 604, the civil year following accession, is treated as the first regnal year. So, too, by Josephus; for he synchronizes Jehoiakim's fourth year with the year when "Nebuchadnezzar took the government over the Babylonians," and Jehoiakim's eighth year with Nebuchadnezzar's fourth. So also in the record whence Jer. lii. 28-30 is taken. On the other hand, Jeremiah and Palestinian writers of his day generally numbered the accession year of Nebuchadnezzar his first year, synchronizing Jehoiakim 4 with Nebuchadnezzar 1, and Zedekiah 11 with Nebuchadnezzar 19.

Jer. lii. 28-30 is a supplementary enumeration of captives, from some other writer than the prophet (li. 64). The deportation of the seventh year refers either to captives carried off when Jehoiakim fell, whose number according to Josephus was 3000 (*Ant.* x. vi. 3): or more probably to those deported with King Jehoiachin; and, for some unexplained reason, enumerates (like Jer. xxix. 2) only the court officials and artisans, who numbered 3000 (2 Kg. xxiv. 14-16). The deportation of the eighteenth year took place when Jerusalem was captured. The three deportations were thus closely related to the history of Zedekiah's reign.

Evil-merodach's accession as early as Tisri, *i. e.*, the seventh month, is attested by the Egibi tablets (TSBA. 1878, vi, 52; Rec. Past xi. 87). He released Jehoiachin in the twelfth month, *i. e.*, Adar.

From the foregoing exposition, it seems legitimate to conclude:

1. That "the Jewish method of reckoning reigns," in the sense of an unvarying mode, is a fiction. Neither Assyrians, nor Egyptians, nor Israelites followed a uniform method; but their scribes adopted at pleasure any one of several recognized modes of chronological reference. That Assyrian dates are more readily determined than the Hebrew is due to the additional aid and restriction furnished by the eponym canon.

2. That the Hebrew data are capable of arrangement on a plan analogous to the methods of chronological reckoning in vogue among contemporary neighboring nations, into a system harmonious in itself and consistent with Hebrew history. An erroneous reference thereto, such as Asa 36, no more vitiates the authority of the chronology as a whole than does a false reference to the eponym list, such as dating the battle of Karkar in the eponymy of Asur-banai-utsur, detract from the value of the Assyrian canon. This arrangement, furthermore, apart from one obstacle, is so far as proof reaches in accord with established foreign chronology. That obstacle seems to lie in the first half century of the second section. In regard to it: (1) Perhaps—

though not probably—the present copy of the eponym list is at fault. The canon is a magnificent monument of unquestioned authority. The fragments, however, show occasional omissions and insertions; and the portion before 810 has received as yet confirmation but in parts; sections of it existing in but single copy, without proof that names have not been accidentally omitted. (2) Or perhaps—though this is not the only alternative—as already suggested, the usurpation of Athaliah was not regarded by the scribes of Joash's time as a separate reign, but as a disagreeable episode of the reign of Joash: as in England the commonwealth was ignored and “the first year of Charles II's reign was called the twelfth; king *de jure* on the death of Charles I, 30th January, 1648–49; king *de facto* at the Restoration, 29th May, 1660.” There is also analogy in the history of Omri for reckoning as part of a reign years which preceded the actual national recognition. Athaliah was not of the seed of David and her right to the throne was disallowed by the high priest; during the period of her power, Joash was the legitimate sovereign. Joash was “not above a year old” when hidden from Athaliah (*Ant.* ix. vii. 1; cp. 2 Kg. xi. 21); hence short of fifteen at the birth of Amaziah, the age of Josiah at the birth of his son Jehoiakim. In oriental life, this is both physically possible and readily paralleled. The early marriage of Joash was desirable; since the extinction of the direct line of David was imminent, and in offspring of Joash lay the sole hope of averting the threatened calamity.

PRINCETON.

JOHN D. DAVIS.