Assyro-Hebraic Relations in Sargonid Times

Clyde E. Harrington

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/dropsietheses

Part of the Biblical Studies Commons, Cultural History Commons, History of Religion Commons, Islamic World and Near East History Commons, Jewish Studies Commons, and the Near Eastern Languages and Societies Commons

Recommended Citation
Harrington, Clyde E., "Assyro-Hebraic Relations in Sargonid Times" (1953). Dropsie College Theses. 119. https://repository.upenn.edu/dropsietheses/119

Library at the Katz Center - Archives Room Manuscript. DS119.8.I72 H37 1953.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/dropsietheses/119
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.
Assyro-Hebraic Relations in Sargonid Times

Abstract
During most of the period in which the dynasty founded by Sargon II ruled the Assyrian empire it was the dominant power of the world. It had been growing and developing for centuries and in this era reached the zenith of its power, and then hastened into decline and into total eclipse at the end of this period. Another great power lay dormant in the Nile valley. Egypt was occupied with her internal affairs until near the end of this era when she again asserted herself and tried to fill the gap left by the collapse of Assyria.

In between these great monster states the little country of Judah was situated. It was engulfed by Assyria and struggled afterwards to get free, looking to Egypt for help that never materialised.

These are the three countries that we shall be concerned with in this thesis. As a background for discussion of the specific contacts which follows below let us consider the overall history of this period, 721 to 605 B.C.¹

Degree Type
Dissertation

Degree Name
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Subject Categories
Biblical Studies | Cultural History | History of Religion | Islamic World and Near East History | Jewish Studies | Near Eastern Languages and Societies

Comments
Library at the Katz Center - Archives Room Manuscript. DS119.8.I72 H37 1953.

¹ This dissertation is available at ScholarlyCommons: https://repository.upenn.edu/dropsietheses/119
ASSYRO-HEBRAIC RELATIONS in SARGONID TIMES

721-605 B. C.

by

Clyde E. Harrington
ASSYRO-HEBRAIC RELATIONS IN SARGONID TIMES

by

Clyde E. Harrington

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The Dropsie College
for Hebrew and Cognate Learning

1953
Approval

This dissertation, entitled

Assyro-Hebraic Relations in Sargonid Times

by

Clyde E. Harrington

Candidate for degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

has been read and approved by

[Signatures]

[Date] April 1953
Classified Bibliography

Akkadian Texts

Campbell Thompson, R. The Prisms of Esharradon and Ashurbanipal
(London 1931)


Harper, R. F. Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Part VI (Chicago 1902)

Luckenbill, D. D. The Annals of Sennacherib (OIP II Chicago 1924)

Lyon, D. G. Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons (Leipzig 1888)

Patterson, Archibald Assyrian Sculptures The Palace of Sennacherib
(The Hague 1912-13)

Smith, Samuel Alden Die Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipals II (Leipzig 1887)

Winckler, Hugo Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons 2 vols. (Leipzig 1889)

Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten Vol. II (Leipzig 1894)

Hebrew Text

Kittel, Rudolph Ed. Biblica Hebraica 4th Ed. (Stuttgart 1949)

Transliterations and Translations

Campbell Thompson, R. The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon Vol. II (London 1900)

Lie, A. G. The Inscriptions of Sargon II King of Assyria Part I The Annals (Paris 1929)

Luckenbill, D. D. Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia Vols. I & II Historical Records of Assyria (Chicago 1927)

Classified Bibliography

Piepkorn, A. O. *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal* (Chicago 1933)


Waterman, Leroy *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire* Part I (Ann Arbor 1930)

Winckler, Hugo *Altorientalische Forschungen* Vol. I (Leipzig 1893)

Historical Works

General

*Cambridge Ancient History* Vol. III (New York 1925)


Mayer, Eduard *Geschichte des Altertums* III (Stuttgart 1937)

Olmstead, A. T. *History of Assyria* (New York 1923)

*History of Palestine and Syria* (New York 1931)

Rogers, R. W. *A History of Babylonia and Assyria* (New York 1900)

Souttan, Robinson *A Short History of Ancient Peoples* (New York 1904)

Hebrew History

Graetz, Heinrich *A History of the Jews* I (Philadelphia 1945)

Kittel, Rudolph *Geschichte de Volkes Israel* II (Gotha 1909)

Renan, Ernest *History of the People of Israel* (Boston 1894)


Special Historical Works

Fuller, L. E. *The Historical and Religious Significance of the Reign of Manasseh* (Leipzig 1912)

Honig, Leo L. *Sennacherib's Invasion of Palestine* A Critical Source Study (New York 1926).
Classified Bibliography

Madden, F. W. History of Jewish Coinage and of Money in the Old and New Testaments (London 1864)

Olmstead A. T. Western Asia in the Days of Sargon of Assyria (New York 1908)

Bible Commentaries

Binns, L. Elliott The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah (London 1919)

Burney, C. F. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings (Oxford 1903)

Delitzsch, Frans Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah 2 vols. Translated by Martin (Grand Rapids 1949)

International Critical Commentary

Driver, S. R. Deuteronomy (Edinburgh 1895)

Montgomery Kings (New York 1951)

Curtis & Nadesen Chronicles (New York 1910)

Batten Ezra – Nehemiah (New York 1913)

Cooke Ezechiel Vol. I (New York 1937)

Works on Archeology

Albright, W. F. Archeology and Palestine (Warmsworth, Middlesex 1949)

Finegan, Jack Light from the Ancient Past (Princeton 1946)


Biblical Archeology

Driver, S. R. in Hogarth Authority and Archeology Part I (New York 1899)

Classified Bibliography

Robinson, George L. *The Bearing of Archeology on the Old Testament* (New York 1914)

Rogers, R. W. *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (New York 1912)

Sayce, A. H. *Higher Criticism and the Monuments* (London 1894)


Miscellaneous Works


Rogers, R. W. *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (New York 1908)

Reference Works

Campbell Thompson R. *A Dictionary of Assyrian Chemistry and Geology* (Oxford 1936)

*Encyclopedia Biblica* Vol. II


Gesenius' *Hebrew and Chaldaic Lexicon* translated by Tregelles (Grand Rapids 1949)

Halley, H. N. *Pocket Bible Handbook* 16th Ed. (Chicago 1944)

*Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible* II III

*Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* X

*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* 5 vols. (Grand Rapids 1947)
Classified Bibliography

**Jewish Encyclopedia VI VIII**

Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Revised by Peloubet (Philadelphia 1884)

Wright and Filson *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*
(Philadelphia 1946)

**Articles in Periodicals**


"Isaiah's Attitude in the Sennacherib Campaign" *American Journal of Semitic Languages* (1925) p. 1 ff.


Classified Bibliography


### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. J. S. L.</td>
<td>American Journal of Semitic Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. R. A.</td>
<td>Luckenbill Ancient Records of Assyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. A. H.</td>
<td>Cambridge Ancient History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A.</td>
<td>Olmstead History of Assyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. P. S.</td>
<td>Olmstead History of Palestine and Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. C. C.</td>
<td>International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. S. B. E.</td>
<td>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. L.</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. E. S.</td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. A.</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. A. W.</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bibliography ......................................................... p. 111
Abbreviations ......................................................... p. ix

Chapter I Introduction - Historical Background ................ p. 1

Chapter II The Sargonid Contacts with Israel and Judah .... p. 16

Section 1 The Conquest and Resettlement of Samaria .... p. 17
Section 2 The Revolt of Hamath, Damascus, and Samaria ... p. 20
Section 3 The Revolt of Judah, Philistia, Edom, and Moab . . p. 23
Section 4 The Babylonian Embassy to Hezekiah .......... p. 25

Chapter III Influences of Assyria on Judah ................ p. 60

Section 1 The Religious and Economic Features of Manasseh's
    Reign ............................................................... p. 60

Section 2 Egyptian Contacts with Judah ....................... p. 76

Section 3 Reflections of Assyria in the Prophets .............. p. 81

Appendix I The Sources for these Contacts ................ p. 89

Section 1 The Sources for the Conquest and Resettlement of
    Samaria ............................................................. p. 89

Section 2 The Sources for the Revolt of Hamath, Damascus,
    and Samaria ...................................................... p. 91

Section 3 The Sources for the Revolt of Judah, Philistia,
    Edom and Moab .................................................... p. 92

Section 4 The Source for the Babylonian Embassy to Hezekiah . p. 95

Section 5 The Sources for the Invasion of Palestine by
    Sennacherib ...................................................... p. 96
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 6  The Sources for the Payment of Tribute by
Manasseh to Assyria .............................. p. 116

Section 7  The Source for the Carrying of Manasseh to
Babylon and his Return ............................ p. 120

Section 8  The Source for the Later Resettlement of Samaria . p. 121

Appendix II  Comparison of the Captivities of Necho and Manasseh . p. 122

Notes .............................................................. p. 123

Maps ................................................................. p. 131
ASSYRO-HEBRAIC RELATIONS IN SARGONID TIMES

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION - HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

During most of the period in which the dynasty founded by Sargon II ruled the Assyrian empire it was the dominant power of the world. It had been growing and developing for centuries and in this era reached the zenith of its power, and then hastened into decline and into total eclipse at the end of this period. Another great power lay dormant in the Nile valley. Egypt was occupied with her own internal affairs until near the end of this era when she again asserted herself and tried to fill the gap left by the collapse of Assyria.

In between these great monster states the little country of Judah was situated. It was engulfed by Assyria and struggled afterwards to get free, looking to Egypt for help that never materialized.

These are the three countries that we shall be concerned with in this thesis. As a background for discussion of the specific contacts which follows below let us consider the overall history of this period, 721 to 608 B.C.

Sargon II usurped the Assyrian throne in 722. His first task was to finish the conquest of Samaria in 721. He deported 27,290 people, and placed the land under an Assyrian officer. The kingdom of Israel had come to an end. But before the land was established as a province the Assyrians had to quell a series of revolts in adjacent areas. In 720 a coalition of Hamath, Damascus, Samaria, Gaza, and other cities was defeated in two battles, one at Qarqar and the other at Raphia. To help settle the continued unrest Sargon deported people of Arabian tribes
to Samaria in 715. A few years later a formidable uprising occurred in the south, Philistia, Judah, Edom and Moab joined together. The Assyrian king quickly sent his commander-in-chief into Philistia where the Assyrian nominee for the kingship of Ashdod, Akhi-miti, had been murdered in a rebellion led by a Greek from Cyprus. This man was forced to flee to Egypt whose king sent him back to Sargon. The Assyrians plundered the land of Samaria but do not appear to have touched Jerusalem.

Egypt was to a great extent responsible for these revolts. It was impossible for her to do any more than stir up trouble because the country was in degenerate condition in those times.

The Assyrians, of course, had affairs elsewhere than in Palestine and Syria. Sargon was occupied in consolidating the empire. The Chaldeans gave him trouble chiefly because the wily diplomat, Merodach-baladan, was able to unite all the Chaldean tribes together, and in addition, obtained the Aramean tribes of Babylonia as his allies; and most beneficial of all to his cause, he prevailed upon the king of Elam to come to his aid. The best Sargon could do against this coalition was battle to a draw in 720, before he had to turn his attention elsewhere. Merodach-baladan ruled Babylon in peace, but he so oppressed the people that they grew weary of him. When Sargon again was able to devote his attention to Chaldea, the Elamites, because of internal troubles, didn't interfere, so he easily was victorious. The people of Babylon received him enthusiastically and accepted him as their ruler, in 710. Merodach-baladan so personally prevailed over the Assyrian monarch that he was reinstated in the principedom of his tribe.
The principal task of Sargon's reign was maintenance of Assyrian domination in the northeastern and eastern borders. He gave prompt and effective help to his faithful vassals when attacked by Rusa, king of Urartu, and other princes. During 715 and 714 he conducted two campaigns in that area and defeated the Urartuians and their allies. In the northwest troubles arose and Sargon formed a buffer of states against the Mushki people. Some of Sargon's tributary princes proved unfaithful to him, so he abandoned this method of government and made the districts into Assyrian provinces. He built a series of fortresses against the Mushki. Finally he attacked these people and made Nita, their ruler, tributary in 709.

Hordes of barbarians, the Cimmerians, were coming down from the north. Sargon succeeded in stopping them in 706 and 705, but was killed in the battle. The Cimmerians caused no more trouble for many years.

Meanwhile, in Egypt the last active king of the 22nd dynasty, Sheshonk IV, died in 725 B. C. After him various Libyan chiefs reigned independently in Lower Egypt. The most important of these were Tefnakhte of Sais and Memphis, Hamilt of Hermopolis, Peinédidibast of Heracleopolis, and Input in the Delta, east of Dubasiris. In Upper Egypt a man of great energy and decision, Piankhi, had begun to reign in 743. He had held Thebes for twenty years, and at the death of Sheshonk IV he set out to become the sole ruler of the land of the Nile.

Peinédidibast of Heracleopolis had refused to recognize the rule of Tefnakhte of Sais, so the latter besieged him in Heracleopolis. Peinédidibast appealed to Thebes for aid.
Piankhi sent an army which defeated Tefnakhte and relieved the city. Namil of Hermopolis had been allied with Tefnakhte. He now went south to his own city while Tefnakhte retreated north. Piankhi did not want to advance north with an enemy behind him, so he was soon besieging Namil in his city. It fell after some months. Pefanidibast sent presents to Piankhi who now advanced north, subduing all the towns as he went. When he arrived at Memphis, he took it by a stratagem. The Nile was in flood stage. Piankhi's men brought their ships next to those of Memphis, boarded these and passed over them to the wall of the city. After this conquest, all the Delta princes recognized Piankhi as Pharaoh.

Then Piankhi returned to Nubia, leaving a regent to rule in the north. This man may have been Sib'iu, the turban of Musri, in Assyrian records who was defeated by Sargon at Raphia in 720. Also it may have been him to whom Hoshea, king of Israel sent messengers, as to So, king of Egypt. He was probably the person known as Shabaka, not yet become king, who had been left behind by Piankhi in command of Egypt, and who succeeded Piankhi five years later.

After Piankhi had gone south, Tefnakhte asserted his authority again and ruled independently. He was succeeded by Bocchoris who was captured and burnt alive by Shabaka, who had come to power in 716 as successor of Piankhi and later invaded and recovered all Egypt for his kingdom. He remained quiet for fifteen years.

In Judah, Hezekiah was ruling when Samaria fell. He was active in the revolts against Assyria. Probably about the time
of Sargon's death in 705 he received an embassy which the king of Babylon courteously sent to greet him on his recovery from a dangerous illness. Hezekiah showed them all his treasures and armory; a coalition against Babylon was afoot.

In Assyria, meanwhile, Sennacherib had succeeded Sargon on the throne in 705, and had two years of peace, during which he rebuilt Nineveh. He did not go to Babylon to be accepted there as king. As soon as Sargon had died, Merodach-baladan began his second rebellion against Assyria. Elam was his willing ally, and the Arab tribes also joined him. The wily diplomat had contacted Hezekiah and probably other princes as well. His revolt failed because the Babylonians appointed a king of their own, Marduk-sakir-shum. Merodach-baladan had to hurry and raise troops to drive out this king. After reigning one month this man was driven out. Then, in 703, Sennacherib won a decisive victory over the rebel, and set up Belibni as king in Babylon, but he proved an inept ruler, and the Assyrians had to substitute another king for him. This new prince had a difficult time, though he ruled well for three years. Then the king of Elam carried him off in a surprise attack, setting up another king whom the Assyrians soon carried off to Assyria, leaving Babylon in disorder. A certain Mushezib-Marduk made himself king in the city. He pursued a pro-Chaldean policy and won over the people to oppose Assyria. This opposition caused the Assyrians to blockade the city. Mushezib-Marduk escaped to Elam where he, with the help of the king of Elam, organized a general uprising in discontented Assyrian provinces. Then he returned to Babylon and was acclaimed king in 691. He raised an army, and with Elam and allies from
Assyrian provinces, faced the Assyrians. A bloody but indecisive battle ensued. The next year Elam's internal troubles claimed her attention so Sennacherib was able to besiege Babylon. After nine months he entered and sacked it, carrying Mushezib-Marduk to Assyria. After this Esarhaddon, Sennacherib's son, was put in charge of Babylon.

There was little trouble on the northern and eastern frontiers during Sennacherib's reign. He strengthened provinces on the Elamite border. He found it necessary to conduct one campaign on the northwest frontier against the Greeks who were pressing in.

Trouble arose in Palestine, probably stirred up by Merodach-baladan. Hezekiah of Judah subdued the Philistines and made Jerusalem impregnable. He took measures for the water supply. The famous Siloam inscription tells how the workmen started from each end of the tunnel connecting the Virgin's Spring with the pool of Siloam, and met in the middle. Hezekiah may have been planning to break away from Assyrian domination, but the failure of Merodach-baladan prevented it. But he was in conspiracy with Egypt, which country had now begun again to intrigue against Assyria. Most of the cities of southern Palestine, and Tyre and Sidon were also involved. Askelon and Ashdod threw out their Assyrian appointed rulers and raised up their own, Sidka assuming the kingship of Askelon. Hebron handed over its pro-Assyrian ruler, Padi, to Hezekiah in chains.

In 701 Sennacherib came swiftly through the Phoenician country; Luli of Sidon fled before him, and the Assyrian king made Eshbaal tributary ruler of the city and surrounding towns. As Sennacherib advanced down the coast a group of princes came
to him with their tribute, they were the kings of Samaanurra, Arvad, Beth-Amon, Moab, and Edom. First the Assyrians captured Askelon's cities, then Askelon herself. Sidon was taken and carried away, and in his place was put a son of Pekibtu, an earlier king. This son was given an Assyrian name, Sharru-judari. Next Sennacherib turned toward Ekron, but the forces sent by the Egyptian Delta princes appeared. They were defeated near Eltekeh. Then Ekron was taken, and the anti-Assyrian leaders impaled. Padi was reappointed ruler.

Sennacherib had not been able to obtain Hesekiah's capitulation by sending his officers to him with propaganda messages. Instead he found that the Judean had made ready to stand siege in Jerusalem while he abandoned the rest of his realm to the enemy. The Assyrian army captured forty-six cities and took over two hundred thousand captives. Sennacherib divided the cities among the kings of Ashdod, Ekron and Gaza. The king of Assyria did not wish to take the trouble to besiege Jerusalem, so left a detachment of his army to blockade the city. Thus a huge tribute was exacted from Judah. But Jerusalem escaped the worst. There are traditions of a sudden calamity to the Assyrian army. But the invasion was successful in that Palestine remained quiet afterwards.

Sennacherib in all his campaigns showed a cautious policy. He did not take over the kingship of Babylon until he was forced to do so; he did not interfere with dependent princes just beyond his frontiers in the northeast; and he did not advance into Egypt from Palestine. This policy contributed to the peace of the empire so that the Assyrians were engaged in many peaceful pursuits.
Besides buildings, this monarch had an interest in engineering feats. Civic projects were undertaken, such as wells and irrigation facilities.

Sennacherib met a dismal end. He was murdered by his sons in 681. Esarhaddon succeeded to the throne after he quelled the rebellion resulting from the struggle for the kingship.

In Egypt Shabaka was succeeded by his son, Shabatake, in 700. His cousin Tirhakah murdered him in 689 and became king in his stead. His court was at Tanis from where he could watch what the Assyrians were doing.

In Judea Manasseh succeeded Hezekiah in 692 and reigned for fifty-five years. He was contemporary with both Esarhaddon (681-669) and Ashurbanipal (668-626). Under him Palestine came more under Assyrian influence than before. The worship of the hosts of heaven which he introduced points to the influence of Assyrian astral cults. Excavation has unearthed seals and cylinders; and contract tablets (c. 650 B.C.) found at Gezer, relating to the sale of fields, testify to the presence of Assyrians, the use of their language, and the Assyrian method of dating. For some reason Manasseh was carried off in chains to Babylon. Fresh colonists were settled in Samaria by Esarhaddon and apparently by Ashurbanipal (Ezra 4:2-10). Manasseh was afterwards allowed to return to Jerusalem. He must have been able to assure Assyria of his loyalty. The building ascribed to Manasseh may have been done because as a vassal of Assyria he was expected to oppose the rising power of Egypt.

Esarhaddon did not have much trouble with Babylon, only one campaign was necessary against the son of Merodach-Baladan who
was defeated because Elam failed to support him. Esarhaddon
did restoration work in Babylon.

On the eastern frontier Assyrian authority was imposed on
the land of Basu. One campaign was necessary against Media to
quell rebellion. In the north, the district of Shupria was added
to the realm. The Scythians had taken over the lands adjacent
to Urartu, and formed a coalition against Assyria. It came to
nothing because of the effectual control of the Assyrian governors.
Later the Scythians became allied to the Assyrians through
royal marriage.

In the northwest the empire lost two provinces, Esarhaddon
was devoting his energies elsewhere. He conducted a campaign
against Sidon in 677, which city had revolted. It was captured
and sacked. The Assyrians raided the Arabs also, and increased
their tribute. The empire now controlled all of Palestine and
all the coastline; which was very bad for Egypt.

Esarhaddon decided to attack this land which was Assyria's
chief enemy, with all the trouble it caused by intrigue. He
attempted to invade Egypt in 675 but was driven back by a great
storm. The next year, however, the Assyrians attacked the Delta
area, and secured a foothold there. But before he molested
Egypt anymore, Esarhaddon besieged Tyre unsuccessfully. In 671
with a swift campaign he overwhelmed Tirhakah, king of Egypt,
and captured Memphis. Tirhakah fled to Nubia. The country as
far south as Thebes submitted to the Assyrians. Lower Egypt
was organized as a province of the empire. But the very next
year conspiracy began to develop again, and Esarhaddon set out
on another expedition in 669 to obtain a firmer hold on the
country. But he died on the way, and the army returned home.

Through arrangements he had made beforehand, his eldest son, Shamash-shumu-ukin became king of Babylon, and Ashurbanipal succeeded to the throne of Assyria.

As soon as he heard of the death of Esarhaddon, Tirhakah came swiftly from the south, occupied Thebes, retook Memphis, and put the Assyrian garrisons to the sword. This made it necessary for the Assyrians to subdue the land again. But it was not until 667 that Ashurbanipal was able to proceed to Egypt.

He defeated Tirhakah, took Memphis without a fight. The Ethiopian fled again to Napata, capital of Nubia. Ashurbanipal sailed up the Nile to Thebes and took that city occupying it peacefully. Its prince made a politic submission. The Assyrian king confirmed Esarhaddon's appointments, detailed stronger garrisons, and returned to Nineveh. But no sooner had he gone than the Egyptian princes began intrigue with Tirhakah to put him in power again. The Assyrian officials detected the plotting, arrested the guilty ones, and sent Necho of Sais, and others to Nineveh in chains. The Assyrian officials treated the native people very severely. But Ashurbanipal decided to adopt a conciliatory policy toward Egypt; he honored Necho and sent him back to Sais. To Necho's son, Psamitik, he gave an Assyrian name, Nabu-sheshi-banni, and made him prince of Athribis.

Tirhakah died quietly in 664 at Napata and was succeeded by his nephew and brother-in-law, Tandamesu. The new king started out to recover Egypt. He was well received at Thebes and Elephantine. He advanced to Memphis where he had to fight to take the city. Then he proceeded north to fight with the chiefs there, but none
of them would fight him or welcome him at first. Eventually they submitted, however. He besieged the Assyrians in Memphis. Necho of Sais and Memphis was probably killed in the capture of that city. His son, Psamatik, fled to Assyria.

When Ashurbanipal heard of the situation in 663 he came at once. Tandamane fled to Thebes. The Assyrians pursued him to that city, and he fled to Nubia. Ashurbanipal took Thebes and thoroughly sacked it. (This great event made a great impression in Judah as seen in Nahum 3:8-10). Thereafter this formerly great city ceased to be important. The Ethiopian kings had no other place of strength in Egypt. Napata was too far away to serve for Egypt. So, after this disaster, no Ethiopian king ever came forth from Nubia and claimed to rule in Egypt north of the first cataract.

Ashurbanipal left Egypt in charge of Psamatik, who became Psamatichus I. He ruled all Egypt under the overlordship of Assyria. He owed his kingship to that empire. His rule was recognized in Thebes in 665. Soon he was acknowledged king from Syene to the sea. He remained loyal to Assyria and paid tribute regularly, at least until the Assyrian garrisons were withdrawn, or forced out in 651. There may have been some fighting in which the "brazen men" from Gyges of Lydia, who had quarreled with Ashurbanipal about 654, had helped the Egyptians. The Assyrian king did not send anyone to resist, realizing it was better for the empire to let Egypt go free, and become a friendly ally. The two powers afterwards made an alliance together.

Greek traders and pirates had long been known in Egypt. They established forts and trading marts that brought much wealth
to Egypt. All of which was a big help in stopping the flood of Scythian invaders who overran Asia between 630 and 625 B.C. They were stopped at Egypt's borders. Relations with Nubia remained peaceful, the Ethiopians never tried to recover Thebes. Though Psamaticus I remained faithful to Assyria, he probably took over Ashdod after a long siege, and other Palestinian territory.

The siege of Tyre which Nearhaddon had been carrying on was continued by Ashurbanipal, and settled by a treaty which left Ba'al, king of Tyre, considerable independence. Gyges, king of Lydia, asked for Assyrian help to stem the tide of the hordes of Cimmerians threatening to overrun his country. The Assyrians gave effective help. But while Assyria was engaged in a great struggle with Elam, they were forced to meet the Cimmerians in Cilicia to save Syria from invasion. They were successful in this, the Cimmerians collapsed.

In the north the kingdom of Mannai grew troublesome, so Ashurbanipal sent an expedition against them and subdued them. Also the Assyrians raided Media because it had helped Mannai. The Assyrian king wished to remain at peace with Elam, but factions within that country forced its ruler, Urtaka, to attack Babylonia when the Assyrian army was in Egypt. However, the local garrisons of troops was able to drive back the invader.

The arrangements made by Nearhaddon in Babylonia were that Shamash-shum-ukin be recognized as king throughout the country, but the local governors were to be appointed by, and were responsible to, the king of Assyria. Such a setup was conducive to friction, but, nevertheless, functioned well for many years. But finally the people of Babylon forced Shamash-shum-ukin to rebel against
Assyria. But before this he had secretly allied himself with Elam, Egypt, and the Arabian tribes. The war of these allies against Assyria that ensued was more or less a civil war because the Babylonian troops had been trained in Assyria. The rebels were successful at first, but were defeated in the end. The Assyrian army subdued Elam, which caused civil war in that land. The Arabian tribes also were defeated. While Elam continued to be rendered powerless by internal troubles, Babylon was put under siege. When famine in the city made further resistance impossible, Shamash-shum-ukin, instead of submitting, set fire to his palace and threw himself into the flames. The Assyrians entered the city in 648 and set up a titular king, Kandalam, who reigned peacefully for twenty years.

The Arabians and Elam remained yet to be dealt with. The former were defeated and dispersed and their leaders captured. The Elamites resisted desperately; various of their leaders were driven from pillar to post. The forces of Ashurbanipal went through all parts of the land of Elam, at last capturing and sacking Susa, the capital city, in 639. This was the end of the kingdom of Elam.

In Judah, Manasseh was succeeded by his son, Amon, but this man was slain a year later, and the people of the land placed his son Josiah on the throne, about 637. Scythian bands were invading all around but apparently left Judah untouched.

The first thirty years of Ashurbanipal's reign were very successful, all rebels had been subdued, Egypt and Lydia were friends, the cities of Assyria were operating efficiently. Then suddenly, evil days fell on the king and on the country, we do
not know how. When Ashurbanipal died in 626, his chosen son, Ashuretil-ilani, had to fight an usurper. This long struggle greatly weakened the Assyrian army. During this king's short reign, 626-621, Babylon and Phoenicia assumed independence, but the rest of the empire remained loyal. The next king was driven out by another son of Ashurbanipal, Sin-shar-isium. He was faced by an alliance of Babylon and Media, who were bent on destroying Assyria. Their generals were as good as the Assyrian generals, while the imperial army had been greatly weakened by the civil wars. However, Egypt and the Scythians were helping Assyria. The former had an army in the field which in 616 caused Nabopolassar of Babylon to retreat. But Egypt did nothing more for several years.

Meanwhile, the enemy allies hemmed the Assyrians into a quadrangle, then managed to break through and capture and sack the city of Ashur in 614. But the Assyrians drove the Babylonians back, while the Scythians were to fight the Medes. However, the Scythians betrayed the Assyrian king and joined the Medes and Babylonians in assaulting Nineveh. The city fell in 612 B.C. But some Assyrians escaped to Harran, and held out there under Ashur-uballit until the three enemies combined against them in 610.

Necho II of Egypt, who succeeded Psamaththus I in 609, immediately went to the rescue of the Assyrians. But Harran was not recaptured. He marched again in 608. It was at this time that Josiah of Judah made an effort to stop him and was defeated at Megiddo. Necho occupied Carchemish until 605 when the Babylonians decisively defeated him and forced him to flee in disorder through Syria and Palestine pursued by Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon.
There is no record that Necho ever reached the Euphrates in 608. The following reconstruction of events has been suggested. When the news that Necho was coming with an Egyptian army reached them the Babylonians and the Medes united against the Assyrian king, Ashur-uballit II, and destroyed him before the Egyptian help could arrive.

This fits in with the evidence that Necho was stationed at Riblah, (and did not go to the Euphrates), and that there is no mention of a battle as Assyria's ally against the Babylonians and the Medes, but only of a battle in 605 at Carchemish between Egypt and Babylonia. Assyria no longer existed.

Necho must have been delayed. Evidence for this is found in the Bible. Josiah went out to intercept him. The Judean king was bitter against Assyria, he knew Egypt was her ally, hence he sacrificed himself to keep Necho from helping Ashur-uballit II until the latter was destroyed.

Josiah had been mortally wounded at Megiddo. The people of the land put his son, Jehoahaz, on the throne. But Necho, with his army at Riblah, had him put in chains and sent to Egypt where he died. A heavy indemnity was extracted from Judah, and another son of Josiah, Eliakim, was appointed king, his name being changed by Necho to Jehoiachim. Evidently this new king was more acceptable to Egypt. But Necho was severely beaten in 605 at Carchemish by the Babylonians, and the attempt of Egypt to make itself the heir of the Assyrian empire in the west failed once for all. The territory as far west as Gaza fell to Nebuchadnezzar, and Egypt was confined to her old limits. The Babylonians made no attempt to interfere in Egypt. But Judah became subject to them.
CHAPTER II THE SARGONID CONTACTS WITH ISRAEL AND JUDAH

The historical records of this period reveal that the Hebrews and Assyrians came into actual contact with each other on the following occasions:

1. The Conquest and Resettlement of Samaria
2. The Revolt of Hamath, Damascus, and Samaria
3. The Revolt of Judah, Philistia, Edom, and Moab
4. The Babylonian Embassy to Hezekiah
5. The Invasion of Palestine by Sennacherib
6. The Payment of Tribute by Manasseh to Assyria
7. The Carrying of Manasseh to Babylon and his Return
8. The Later Resettlement of Samaria

For the convenience of the reader the Akkadian and Hebrew sources for these contacts are reproduced and translated in Appendix I in the same order in which they are treated here.
Section 1. The Conquest and Resettlement of Samaria

This event is narrated in two places in the Bible. 2 Kings 17:3-6 and 18:9-11. The former includes all the latter and has some additional preliminary details, so I have reproduced it as the Hebrew source. Another passage, 2 Kings 17:24, gives us information about the resettlement of Samaria. This activity was a part of the result of the conquest of the country. The account following this verse deals with a situation which arose as a result of the resettlement. Thus it is convenient to include this item of the resettlement of Samaria as part of the overthrow of that land.

The Assyrian monarch claims the conquest of Samaria in at least five different inscriptions. Two of these tell of the event in some detail, the Annals, first year, lines 10-17; and the Display Inscription, lines 23-26. The Annals are the primary source and must be referred to to keep the events in chronological order. However, the Display inscription gives a fairly complete report of the happenings and is much better preserved. Therefore, I have made use of the Display inscription account as the Assyrian source. But one important fact is not mentioned therein, the resettlement of Samaria. To take care of this omission I have reproduced line 18 of the Annals, which gives this information, as an additional Assyrian source.

There is reference to the conquest of Samaria, or Bit Rumria, in three other inscriptions. "Pave des Fortes" No. IV, line 31; the Annals of Room XIV, lines 13 & 14; and the Cylinder Inscription, lines 19 & 20. This last report mentions also the settlement of Arab tribes in Samaria.
None of these Assyrian references, except the last, mention the countries from which the people were deported to Samaria. This information can be learned from examining the Annals. We find that Sargon made at least four separate deportations to Syria. Annals, first year (721), lines 19-23, the Assyrian king reports the defeat and deportation of two Aramean tribes of Der in Babylonia to the land of the Hittites. Annals, fifth year (717), lines 76-78 tell of the removal of the men of Pappa and Lallukna (Pappa was a Greek city in Cyprus) to Damascus. Annals, sixth year (716), lines 84-90 report the rebellion, defeat, and deportation of the king and inhabitants of Karalla to Hamath. Annals, seventh year (715), lines 120-123 narrate the conquest and deportation of the survivors of the Tamudi, Ibadidi, Warsiman, and Haipa (Arab tribes) to Samaria. Only this last reference mentions Samaria specifically, the other resettlements were in lands near by.

The Hebrew source supplements the Assyrian records. In the first place 2 Kings 17:6 tells us the destination of the exiled Israelites. Habor is the district of the Habur, the great tributary of the Euphrates in the ancient Aram naharaim. Goser is Akkadian Gusana (Ptolemy's Gusanitis) now identified by von Oppenheim with the region of Tell Halaf. Halah is Akkadian Halahma, possibly Ptolemy's Chalchitis near Gusanitis. 10

Of the places named in 2 Kings 17:24 Hamath and Sepharvaim were in northern Syria, Avva is unknown. Hamath revolted in 720 and it was probably rebels whom Sargon transported to Samaria. Probably the men of other cities were rebels also. Those from Cuthah and Babylon must have come later. 11 It is unlikely that
Sargon would have deported cultured men from Babylon because he cared so well for that city. 12 The account, 2 Kings 17:25 ff. Olmstead places under Sargon, however. 13

An examination of the Hebrew sources gives one the impression that Shalmaneser was the king who conquered Samaria. But the Assyrian inscriptions give Sargon the credit for this achievement. So most scholars consider the Bible account ambiguous. S. R. Driver 14 and Sayce 15 show the typical view. Olmstead, however, has a theory that the Assyrian records cannot be trusted, while the Hebrew account is much more likely to be accurate. He believes Shalmaneser conquered Samaria, and died soon afterwards. Sargon usurped his throne and took to himself credit for the achievements of the last year of his predecessor. He did handle the deportation and resettlement matters himself though. Olmstead claims to find evidence for his view in the Babylonian Chronicle and even in the Assyrian Chronicle 16. Rogers mentions a somewhat similar idea, but only as a suggestion. He says Samaria may have fallen while Shalmaneser still lived, and the news only reached Assyria after his decease. He cites Winckler as expressing the same view. 17

Olmstead's theory fits the evidence. It accounts for the Bible record giving Shalmaneser credit for the victory on the one hand, and for Sargon claiming the credit on the other hand. However, it has the rather drastic consequence of moving the date of the fall of Samaria back to 723. at least, Olmstead gives it that date. 18

Rogers and Winckler's view fits the evidence equally well, and does not necessarily affect the date of 721 at all. Sargon would be sure to lay claim to the conquest of Samaria as soon as
possible. He mentions it as the first event of his reign.

Olmstead found evidence in the Chronicles to cause him to put the conquest a year earlier than usual. I do not know the value of this evidence. But other scholars have not accepted the date of 723. In fact, most scholars seem to give Sargon credit for the fall of Samaria, and read ambiguity into the Bible record.

I think the best conclusion from the whole matter is to hold Shalmaneser as the victor at Samaria, thus taking the Bible account at its face value, to discount Sargon's claims, thus acknowledging their untrustworthiness which Olmstead has demonstrated, and to keep the date of 721 for the event, as there does not seem to be sufficient reason against it.

The mention of So, king of Egypt in the Hebrew account is interesting. His identification and the time he reigned will be discussed in relation with Sib'te Turan of Egypt mentioned in the Assyrian source for the next contact.

Section 2. The Revolt of Hamath, Damascus, and Samaria

This event is not mentioned in the Bible, even though Samaria participated in it. After the conquest of that country and the deportation of her inhabitants the Bible writers were no longer interested in her. Subsequently Samaria is only referred to in relation to Judah, and never for her own sake.

In the Assyrian inscriptions this revolt is mentioned in at least five places being narrated in some detail each time; in the Annals, second year (720), lines 23-57; in the Display Inscription, lines 33-37 and 25-26; on the Cyprus Stela, right face, lines 51-65; in the Assur Charter line 16 ff.; and in the Cylinder Inscription.
line 21 ff. I have made use of the Assyrian text for this contact source as I did for the first contact, and for the same reasons. But this report, being set up geographically and not chronologically has this revolt set forth in two parts. The last part of the event is attached to the account of the conquest of Samaria. And furthermore, the record of tribute from Arabia is put with this revolt. Reference to the Annals account straightens out the situation. So we know this campaign took place in the second year of Sargon, 720 B. C. As indicated above, it was probably because of this revolt that men of Hamath were deported to Samaria.

Sib's turtan of Egypt mentioned in the Assyrian story of this revolt is most likely the same person called So, king of Egypt in the Hebrew account of the fall of Samaria. This person is denoted as follows in various languages and by different writers: Hebrew XIΩ (might be pointed XIΩ); Akkadian Sib'u; LXX Σαγώρα, Σάωα; Manetho Σέβεκχοσ; Latin 'Sevechus'; Herodotus Σαβακών. In all probability he was Shabaka, founder of the XXV dynasty of Egypt. But he did not become king until 715 B. C. The battle at Raphia with Sargon occurred in 720. However, he might very well have been commander of the Egyptian army in 720. This is indicated by the Assyrian calling him turtan (general) of Egypt. If this was his true situation, then we must consider why the Hebrew record calls him king. Let us first ascertain the situation in Egypt at this period. Independent Delta princes were ruling in Lower Egypt until Piankhi of Ethiopia came down from the south and conquered all of Egypt. But then he went back to Ethiopia leaving a regent in charge. After this
the Delta princes asserted themselves again. Piandchi died in 715 and was succeeded by Shabaka who became ruler of all Egypt. He might have been the regent left in charge of Lower Egypt by Piandchi. If that was the case it is easy to see why the Hebrew scribe called him king, as he did become king later. He would most likely have been the person to whom Hoshea, king of Israel sent for aid, and also he would be in command of the army of Lower Egypt.

Or So might have been one of the Delta kings in command of his army, or of an army made up of soldiers from all of Lower Egypt. Such a person would most likely be called a king by a Hebrew writer.

I think it most accurate to say that So or Sib’u was Shabaka, not yet become king, but he was in command of the Egyptian army, and he had been left behind by Piandchi in charge of Lower Egypt.

The Nimrud inscription is of uncertain date, but I place it here because of its mention of the defeat of Iaubi’di of Hamath, which is of course a reference to this revolt. What Sargon means by styling himself subduer of Judah is not clear. There is no evidence that he ever invaded Judah. Driver suggests that it need not mean more than that Sargon extracted tribute from Judah. If that is the case, that was not a new achievement for an Assyrian king because we know from two sources that Ahaz of Judah paid tribute to Tiglath Pileser III: 2 Kings 16:7 ff. and the Nimrud Tablet (K 5751 of British Museum) of Tiglath Pileser III (dated 728 B. C.) mentions that this Assyrian monarch received tribute from Ahaz (Jehoehaz) of Judah as well as from neighboring princes. Later, as we shall see below, Judah was implicated in the rebellion
of Ashdod and is referred to as paying tribute then. The Nimrud inscription of Sargon may refer to this revolt. If so, then this brief reference cites two uprisings, that of Hamath, and that of Ashdod. 24

Section 3. The Revolt of Judah, Philistia, Edom, and Moab

This rebellion, which began with the king of Ashdod, is mentioned in the Bible by Isaiah (20:1) in an interesting manner. It is an incidental reference but used by the prophet in a way which indicates that the people of Judah were well acquainted with this uprising. Isaiah said in effect, "when this revolt happened then I did such and such." He was using this rebellion, and their knowledge of it, as a means for checking the time at which another event took place.

The Assyrian inscriptions relate this revolt in detail on at least four different occasions: the Annals, eleventh year, lines 249-262; the Display Inscription, lines 90-113; the Annals of Room XIV, lines 11-15; and the broken Prism A, fragment D. I have reproduced the account of the Display Inscription as the Assyrian source because it gives the most complete information of all the accounts. I have supplemented this record with lines 26-33 of Prism A, fragment D as this is the only place in which all the participants in the revolt are named. The one called "he" in this reference is, of course, Asuri of Ashdod.

The date of this uprising is given by Olmstead as 714 B.C. 25 The Annals of Sargon give 711. C. A. H. III p. 388 gives 712. Olmstead has investigated this matter and shown the Annals date of 711 varies from the date on Sargon's prisms, which is 714. He has also demonstrated that the Annals are incorrect in other
items of information as well. So I think there is sufficient reason for accepting 714 as the correct date for this revolt.

Olmstead points out a contradiction and an untrue statement in this Assyrian report. The Annals, line 259, state that Sargon carried off the Greek usurper as a captive. The Display Inscription, lines 102-103, states that this Greek fled to Ethiopia. Line 122 states that the king of Ethiopia sent him back to Sargon in chains. One of these accounts must be untrue, as they contradict each other. The broken Prism A, fragment D account says this Greek fled. The report in the Annals of Room XIV mention his flight and his extradition by the king of Ethiopia to Sargon. So most of our evidence agrees with the Display Inscription account. Therefore, the Annals passage is probably untrue.

The short Hebrew reference to this revolt affords a means of checking the accuracy of the Assyrian accounts. The Hebrew source says that Sargon sent his tartan to quell the rebellion at Ashdod. All the Assyrian records narrating this event say that Sargon led the expedition in person. The royal scribes of Sargon certainly were always inclined to give their king as much personal glory as possible. They would have a reason for stating Sargon was in personal command. On the other hand, the Hebrew prophet would have no reason to care who led the expedition. This "personal equation" element being present in the Assyrian accounts and being absent in the Hebrew report is a sufficient reason for accepting the latter as true. C. A. H. III (p. 388) accepts the Hebrew version because it states that "Sargon sent his general into Philistia where Ashdod and Gath were chief centers of revolt."
Section 4. The Babylonian Embassy to Hezekiah

This event is as well attested as possible by its three Hebrew sources, 2 Kings 20:12,13; Isaiah 39:1,2; and 2 Chronicles 32:31. Every Hebrew account giving the history of this time mentions it. The fact that there is no reference to it in Assyrian inscriptions does not militate against its truth at all because this is just what we expect under the circumstances. This embassy was part of a conspiracy against Assyria. The whole plot was probably known or at least suspected by Assyria. It may have been one item of the score against Hezekiah when Sennacherib attacked him. Assyria had so much against Narodach-Baladan they never got around to mentioning his intrigues with princes outside the vicinity of Babylonia and Elam. So it is not strange that this embassy is not mentioned in Assyrian records.

Of the three Hebrew sources 2 Kings 20:12,13 and Isaiah 39:1,2 are almost identical. One must have been the source of the other. 2 Chronicles 32:31 is an incidental reference cited in estimating Hezekiah's character. I have reproduced the source from Isaiah as it is just slightly more complete.

The lack of reference to this event in Assyrian records makes the date of it a problem. Its place in the Bible indicates it happened after Sennacherib's invasion of Judah. But the situation between Assyria and Babylon, as well as between Assyria and Judah make it much more likely that it occurred before this. There is no evidence that after this invasion, Judah conspired against Assyria during Hezekiah's reign. But there is abundant evidence for conspiracy before the invasion. As for the relations between Assyria and Babylon, Sargon's reign provides the best opportunities.
Merozad-Baladan fought the Assyrians to a draw at Der in 720 and thereafter reigned undisturbed in Babylon until 709. During this interval the wily Babylonian ruler was busy building up support for his cause. So it is perfectly possible that he sent an embassy to Judah in this period. A date around 712 B.C. for the event would be about right if it happened in this interval of time. Some scholars believe it more likely that this embassy occurred right after Sargon's death in 705. Merozad-Baladan began his second rebellion against Assyria then and would be very apt to try to win Judah to his side. 27

Judah was in revolt against Assyria in 714 in the uprising begun by Azur of Ashdod. No doubt she continued in a rebellious spirit up to Sennacherib's invasion in 701. Either date of 712 or 705 fits the Judean situation.

We may be sure that Merozad-Baladan contacted other princes in the same period he contacted Judah. Probably he conspired with all Assyria's vassals and enemies, including Egypt.

Whenever it occurred, Hezekiah no doubt recognized the importance of the occasion. Merozad-Baladan was a wily and able diplomat, and the most persistent and successful foe of Assyria. The king of Judah put his best foot forward, so to speak, to impress the visitors. He showed them all his wealth and armory. This indicates his eagerness and willingness to rebel against Assyria. This fits in with other evidence we have of his actions against Assyria, such as the imprisonment of Padi, the pro-Assyrian king of Ekron.

It is remarkable that the embassy from Babylon to Judah is mentioned in the Bible when none of the other actions of Judah
against Assyria are referred to. I think this particular action in rebellion is mentioned as background for Isaiah's prophecy of the Babylonian conquest of Judah. When the prophet found the king elated over his alliance with Babylon it was a good time to impress upon him the folly of dependence upon any foreign nation. The prediction must have astounded Hezekiah, he could only say, it won't happen in my time. The incident of the prophet's prediction is told in 2 Kings and in Isaiah in practically identical words, showing one was source of the other. I think Isaiah's account was the primary source. It is such an effectively impressive prophecy that Isaiah would be sure to include it in his record. The reference to the embassy in 2 Chronicles cites this affair as a test of the king's character, and intimates he failed to measure up to what was required of him. This fits in with the prophecy which was pronounced with part of its purpose to rebuke the king.

Section 5. The Invasion of Palestine by Sennacherib

This may have been only a hurried march into Palestine for the Assyrians, as Olmstead says, but it was a tremendous event for the Hebrews. There are three lengthy accounts of it in the Bible and many references to it in the prophecies of Isaiah.

The three Hebrew reports of the invasion are: 2 Kings 18:13-19:37; Isaiah 36:1-37:36; and 2 Chronicles 32:1-21. The most complete of all these is the 2 Kings account. I have therefore used that as the Hebrew source. The Isaiah passage corresponds very closely to the 2 Kings account except it omits three verses, 2 Kings 18:14-16. The report in 2 Chronicles is an abridgement of the other two accounts. Part of it, describing Hezekiah's preparation for the
defense of Jerusalem, is different from the other accounts so
I have also included it as an additional Hebrew source.

The Assyrian inscriptions describe this invasion as the third
campaign of Sennacherib in the various editions of the Annals of
that king. The Rassam Cylinder written in 700 B.C. contains
the fullest account of the third campaign. The text in this
inscription became the standard report that the Assyrian scribes
used in subsequent editions of the annals. This standard account
is included in the final edition of the Annals which form the
text of the famous Taylor Prism. A later copy of the final edition
is found on the Oriental Institute Prism, dated in 689 B.C. This
latter prism's account of the third campaign is the Assyrian
source I have used. But for some reason in using the Rassam
Cylinder account for subsequent editions of the annals the
scribes omitted the last part of it, lines 56 to the end. It
so happens that lines 56-60 deal with Hezekiah's tribute, and
are therefore pertinent to the contact we are now discussing.
So I have used these lines as an additional Assyrian source.

As indicated above Sennacherib's campaigns were written up
several times. An account of the third campaign is given in a
Dull Inscription which closely resembles the Oriental Institute
Prism account. A very brief report of the third campaign in the
Nebi Yunus slab inscription mentions Sidon and Judah only. New
information is given in an epigraph from a relief in Sennacherib's
palace which carries an inscription telling us that King Sennacherib
is reviewing the booty of Lachish. I have used this also as an
Assyrian source.

It is evident that the Hebrew and Assyrian sources supplement
each other. There is only one contradiction; that occurs in the amount of silver talents included in Hezekiah's tribute. The Bible says 300 talents of silver, the Assyrian sources say 800.

There has been much discussion of this discrepancy, most of it being based on the idea that the Assyrians used a lighter talent than the Hebrews did. This was asserted by Brandis in his book Münze-Maße und Gewichtswesen in Vorderasien (Berlin 1866) p. 98 in this manner, as quoted by Schrader: "The difference in the account of the amount of tribute is due to the fact that the silver talents were calculated differently, the Babylonian silver talent being light while the Palestinian silver talent was heavy. The latter was precisely 8/3 of the former. Therefore, the Biblical and Assyrian accounts of the amount of the tribute are completely identical."

Burney, McCurdy, Robinson, and McClymont all cite either Brandis or Schrader or this point, accepting Brandis' declaration as clearing up the contradiction involved. Montgomery also follows along in this view. He says the discrepancy between 300 and 800 talents has been explained as due to the difference in "light" and "heavy" talents.

F. W. Madden gives figures indicating that the Palestinian heavy talent, which was for gold only, equals more than 2-3/4 Babylonian light silver talents. So I cannot understand how Brandis found a Palestinian heavy talent to equal 2-2/3 Babylonian light talents. Sanda does not accept Brandis' view because there is no evidence to prove that the Hebrew silver talent equals 2-2/3 Assyrian talents.

It is well known that the common Palestinian talent was
3000 shekels while the common Babylonian and Assyrian talent consisted of 3600 shekels. 60 shekels was a maneh in Babylon, 50 shekels was a maneh among the Hebrews. 60 maneh equals 1 talent in both lands. 36

This indicates that the Palestinian talent was lighter than the Assyrian, not heavier.

The usual argument is that the heavy gold talent of Palestine and the light or ordinary talent of Babylon were used. But even this, as Marden shows, does not equalize the accounts. And it is very unlikely that Hezekiah would pay the silver tribute in heavy gold talents; that would cost him twice as much silver as the heavy gold talent was just double the silver talent in weight. This leaves us with no solution to the problem. All that can be said is that the 800 figure in the Assyrian account may be an exaggeration.

There are some bits of evidence not given in the texts used as sources. Herodotus II p. 141 has a story which tells of an Assyrian invasion of Egypt which met with disaster. This story is given in Honor, p. 56, and discussed in detail in the following pages. The important thing about this story is that it must have a historical basis, though we are not sure just what that basis is. Herodotus calls Sennacherib king of the Arabians and Assyrians. There are some Assyrian inscriptions which prove Sennacherib conducted a campaign against the Arabs, probably late in his reign. In the Berlin Museum is an alabaster fragment registered as V.A. 3510 which must have described an Arabic campaign in considerable detail. Also there is an inscription on the reverse side of an alabaster slab in the Berlin Museum.
(Ass. 11047) lines 22-27 which refers to an Arabian campaign. This last is translated in Luckenbill A. R. A. II par. 368. Beside these records of Sennacherib we find mention of this Assyrian king's Arabian campaign in the inscriptions of both Shakhkash and Ashurbanipal. The former refers to it in three different accounts: Prism 3 Col. IV 2 ff., Prism A Col. II 55 ff., and Prism B (th 1929-10-12.) Col. IV 1-13. The latter king has two references to it: British Museum K3087 and K3405. The fact that Sennacherib conducted a campaign against the Arabs being established we must consider why there is no record of it in his annals. The latest edition of the annals is dated 696 and the Arab campaign probably took place after this. It may have been included in a later edition of the annals which has not yet been or perhaps never will be, found. The expedition may not have been led in person by the king and hence was not mentioned. We knew of two campaigns that were not included in the annals for this reason. Sixth edition of the annals describes two Cilician campaigns led by Sennacherib's generals, which were not included in the Taylor Prism record. The Arabian campaign may have ended in disaster and so was eliminated from the Assyrian records. But Luckenbill reminds us that a great defeat of Sennacherib would probably have been recorded in the Babylonian Chronicle which usually reported Assyrian defeats, or if Sennacherib had suffered a disastrous defeat in a second campaign he would probably not have passed over it in silence. More likely he would have his scribes write up an account covering up his defeat as he did in regard to the battle of Halule.

This leads us to a discussion of the Assyrian records which
we do possess. From the statement above we see that the Assyrian accounts may not always be trustworthy. Dr. A. T. Olmstead, an eminent Assyriologist, says, "the official Assyrian records demand an drastic a higher criticism as has ever been inflicted upon any part of the Old Testament. We may compare one record with another, one edition with an earlier, or an Assyrian statement with that of a Hebrew, the pictorial with the written, and at every stage we shall have plentiful examples of untruth." Then he gives some instances to prove it. In discussing contact III, I mentioned some of these false statements. Another outstanding Assyriologist, Dr. D. D. Luckenbill says, "Scribes of kings, Assyrian and elsewhere, magnify the smallest military success into a mighty victory; multiply by 10 or 20 the number of enemy slain or captured, and the amount of tribute received; transform a defeat that cannot be passed over in silence into a dignified retreat from cold of winter, or springtime flood." As a case in point, which occurs in the Assyrian source for this contact, Sennacherib claims he took 200,150 captives from Judah. Olmstead says such a number of captives from a few square miles of rocky country is absurd. Doubtless 150 is the correct number suffixed to a high round number. It may very well be that the high tribute elicited from Hezekiah is another exaggeration. Perhaps, as we have noted above, even the 600 talents of silver is a somewhat enlarged amount also.

The fact that Sennacherib admits blockading Jerusalem I think, indicates he intended to besiege and take it. He does not state why he left the city without capturing it.

The Hebrew sources are threefold. The Isaiah and 2 Kings
accounts being so similar they must be directly related. I think the original source is Isaiah’s, he wrote an account of the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib in his book of prophetic messages because it was the outstanding event of his life, many of his prophecies concerned it. The outcome of the invasion was a glorious victory for Yahweh, a vindication of many of Isaiah’s predictions. I believe that the illustrious prophet would want to tell this story himself, not give someone else’s version.

I realize most scholars consider Isaiah’s account to be taken from the Kings report because the former is briefer in many statements, and omits three verses altogether. Apparently most scholars believe the fullest account is the original. Honor (pp. 39 & 71 n. 16) notes that Olmstead has pointed out that the translations indicate a definite tendency to elaborate the text rather than to abridge it. Also I wish to call attention to the fact that in the science of textual criticism two rules have been evolved which are called the golden canons of transcriptional probability of a scribe’s work. First rule – The shorter reading is to be preferred (as the original) to the longer reading. Second rule – The more difficult is to be preferred to the easier reading.

These rules will fit any situation where two manuscripts or copies of a particular text are to be compared to ascertain which is the original and which is the copy, because they are based on the tendencies of copyists. These canons bear out Olmstead’s point referred to above. Therefore, I consider that the evidence offered by the accounts of Isaiah and of 2 Kings is all in favor of Isaiah’s report being the original. When the scribe set
out to write up the history of Hezekiah's reign and came to the event of the invasion he very naturally made use of Isaiah's account. Of course, he availed himself of state and temple records also. Isaiah had written a running account of the part of the invasion that concerned Jerusalem; i. e., the blockade of that city and the demand for surrender, giving the part Hezekiah and himself had played in the affair. The scribe wanted to supplement the prophet's account with a few facts about the tribute and its payment. He did not wish to break into the running account of Isaiah so put this information at the beginning right after verse 1, which serves as the introduction. Then he proceeded to write the story following Isaiah very closely. When he finished the report of the invasion he followed the prophet in narrating Hezekiah's illness though here he knew a few things Isaiah had not included and put them in the Kings account. The scribe omitted the record of Hezekiah's song of praise as not being suitable for his official state record. Then he kept very close to Isaiah in writing up the account of the Babylon embassy and the prophecy that came forth because of it. After this he brought the history of Hezekiah to an end in characteristic fashion.

As noted above the Hebrew and Assyrian accounts supplement each other. I believe each Hebrew source is authentic. The Assyrian sources are authentic also according to the Assyrian point of view. But not according to the view of a modern historian. In addition, I believe the story of Herodotus has a historical basis. This is my attitude toward the various items of the sources. I believe the evidence that Sennacherib did conduct a campaign against the Arabs, late in his reign. I do not think
this has anything to do with the Hebrew accounts, but does have something to do with Herodotus' story.

Honor in his helpful book on this event has summarised the various theories in a table on pages 61 and 62. Each hypothesis depends on one's view of the evidence, and as to whether or not Sennacherib waged one or two campaigns in Palestine. I believe the evidence indicates only one campaign. I reconstruct the events of the invasion as follows: Sennacherib began the third campaign by going against Sidon whose king Luli fled, its cities submitted, Ethba'al was put on the throne as a vassal ruler, bound to give annual tribute. As the Assyrian king proceeded down the coast the vassal princes who decided to remain loyal brought their tribute to him. But Sidka of Askalon was not among them. So he was besieged in his city and captured, Askalon and its towns were taken and despoiled. The people of Ekron had turned their pro-Assyrian ruler Padi over to Hezekiah for safe keeping. As Sennacherib was about to assault Ekron, an Egyptian army led by Tirhakah, nephew of Shabaka king of Ethiopia, came up and formed in battle formation near Eltekeh. They were defeated by the Assyrians who captured some of the princes and charioteers. Eltekeh and Timnah, a neighboring town, were captured and despoiled. Then the Assyrian king went to Ekron and severely punished the rebel therein. After this Sennacherib sent part of his army with Rabshakeh, a high official, to blockade Jerusalem and demand its surrender, while the king went about plundering Judean towns. So Rabshakeh came with his force of soldiers to the city and delivered his propaganda speech as recorded in Isa. 36:4-20 and 2 Kings 18:19-35. He got no response
to his lecture. Then he put the blockade in force around the city. Inside the walls Hezekiah in distress sent to Isaiah; the prophet responded with a prediction that Sennacherib would hear a report and return home to be murdered. The Arab, mercenary troops Hezekiah had brought in to help him deserted him, the Assyrians letting them out through the gate. The Judean king being alarmed at this, and noting the people were getting panicky, decided to submit. He sent Padi to Sennacherib, who had taken Lachish and was now using that city as his headquarters. Along with the Ekron king Hezekiah sent messengers to find out the amount of tribute required. Sennacherib accepted Padi and had him escorted and enthroned in Ekron. He set the amount of annual tribute Ekron was to pay. He stipulated the tribute Hezekiah was to pay over and above his annual tribute. As the Judean messengers returned to Jerusalem the Assyrian king sent notice to Rabshakeh to raise the blockade and join him. Before this official arrived Sennacherib had begun to besiege Libnah. Soon after this word came to the Assyrian king that a powerful force under Tirhakah was approaching. He did not want to fight Egypt while he left an unconquered enemy behind him in Jerusalem. So he sent a force back to that city to renew the blockade and demand for surrender. The Judeans were in consternation over this new blockade after the tribute had been settled. Hezekiah prayed fervently and Isaiah encouraged him. He poured forth a wonderful prophecy ending with the prediction that no harm would befall the city, and the Assyrian king would return to his own city. Thus strengthened Hezekiah refused to surrender. Meanwhile Sennacherib had gone against the Egyptians and drove them back. He pursued them to
Pelusium near the border of Egypt. Encamped against that town his troops became afflicted with the bubonic plague. Very quickly most of his army was wiped out. There was nothing Sennacherib could do but retreat with the small force left him. He recalled the blockading force from Jerusalem and hurried back to Nineveh. Hesekiah found it necessary to clean out the palace and temple treasuries and also to strip the gold off the temple doors and its pillars to obtain enough to meet the tribute requirements. After the Assyrians were gone, he sent it to Nineveh by special messenger. Sennacherib negotiated a treaty with Shabaka. Twenty years later he was murdered by his sons.

This reconstruction follows both the Assyrian and the Hebrew accounts, each supplementing the other. The Assyrian record does not mention the matter of the Egyptians coming against Sennacherib because this resulted in disaster to the Assyrians. They did well everywhere else so this incident was very conveniently left out. The Bible narrative does not say the city was blockaded, but the Assyrian account does say so. But the Hebrew story notes that Rabshakeh had a large army with him when he came to Jerusalem. Why would he have a huge force, if he were not going to blockade the city?

I have taken into account the story of Herodotus II 141 also. That is why I placed the disaster to Sennacherib's army at Pelusium. The Bible records the disaster, it does not say where it happened.

As noted before the number of captives and the amount and variety of tribute given in the Assyrian account are no doubt greatly exaggerated. From the huge tribute recorded one would think Jerusalem had been captured. But Sennacherib had to admit
he did not achieve this.

I think the captive king of Edron would be required to be released before the offer to pay tribute would be accepted. He was of no more value to Hezekiah.

Tirhakah is designated king of Ethiopia in the Biblical accounts whereas he was not actually king until 689. Isaiah writing in his old age after this date naturally called Tirhakah king even though he was not actually king at the time of the invasion of Palestine by Sennacherib in 701.

There is a problem in chronology in the Hebrew accounts of the invasion of Palestine in relation to the conquest of Samaria. According to Isaiah 36:1a and 2 Kings 18:13a Sennacherib's campaign took place in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, while 2 Kings 18:9 ff. says the fall of Samaria occurred in his sixth year. Thus there is only eight years between these two events. But we know from Assyrian records that there are twenty years between them. Various suggestions have been made to account for these dates in the Bible record. Montgomery thinks there may have been a scribal miswriting of '14' for '24,' which latter figure would give the correct date.55 If that were the case the mistake must have been made in the record of Isaiah, as that is most likely the original account, and then copied in the Kings report. However, it does not seem likely that the scribe who had access to the royal records would be apt to copy such a mistake especially so close to the report of the fall of Samaria.

Chronologists who have to cope with this problem are not so much concerned about the reconstruction of events as they are about adjusting the dates. It is best of course to stick to the
figures given in the Hebrew text and assume they are correct, until proved wrong.

In discussing the Nimrud inscription of Sargon above I mentioned one way in which the problem is solved. The excellent table Gehman supplies illustrates this method. Hezekiah began to reign about 727, thus the fall of Samaria in 721 would come in his sixth year. Then about 713 Sennacherib, acting as general for his father Sargon, invades Judah and Hezekiah pays tribute as narrated in 2 Kings 18:13-16, and Isa. 36:1. That would be in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. Sargon's Nimrud inscription shows Judah was tributary to Assyria at this time. Then in 701 Sennacherib as king invaded Palestine again, this is reported in Isa. 36:2 ff. and 2 Kings 18:17 ff. Thus all the dates are adjusted and the Bible texts distributed accordingly, and the Assyrian evidence is made to support the arrangement.

The chief objection to this setup is how can it be accounted for that Hezekiah's tribute which he paid in 713 is reported by the Assyrians as obtained from him in 701? Even though the number of talents of silver vary, the amount of gold is identical. The tribute was imposed at Lachish, the Bible reports, and the epigraph from Sennacherib's palace illustrates the situation at that city. This seems to tie the two together. The Lachish conquest must have been made when Sennacherib was king, as the epigraph declares he was, hence it must have occurred in 701. This again ties the account in 2 Kings 18:13-16 to 701.

Also verse 1 of Isaiah 36 seems more like an introduction to the following account than the whole story of one invasion. If it were such then verse 2 begins the report of another campaign
in rather abrupt fashion, as does verse 17 of 2 Kings 18 also.
These verses cannot be understood without the previous verse or
verses. I do not think either Isaiah or the scribe of Kings
would write up history this way.

Moreover, Isaiah 36:2, and 2 Kings 18:17 both mention officers
sent from Lachish. This again binds these verses with the pre-
vious ones; and, as indicated above, ties them to the 701 campaign.

The evidence we possess does not seem to favor the arrange-
ment of events of the chronological scheme. The problem of dates
cannot satisfactorily be solved in that fashion. A mistake in
the Bible text seems indicated. But even that does not settle
the matter, for how do Isaiah and Kings have the same mistake?
As I mentioned above such an error must have been obvious to the
scribe of Kings.

These matters of chronology makes one mindful of the fact
that Hezekiah must have been dead by 690. Those scholars who
believe that two campaigns are narrated in this section of the
Bible place the second invasion late in Sennacherib's reign.
If there was another campaign in the vicinity of Jerusalem it
must be late in his reign because there is no room more evidence
to put it earlier. Usually it is inserted into Sennacherib's
Arabian campaign for which campaign there is evidence as cited
above. The point I want to make here is that late in Sennacherib's
reign would be after 690, and any invasion of Judah would find
Manasseh on the throne there. I think this shows that the Bible
record cannot include the story of a second campaign of Sennacherib.

The campaign Hezekiah conducted against the Philistines
mentioned in 2 Kings 18:8 may have been in connection with the
Ashdod revolt of 714 rather than with Ekron troubles of 701. 17
Padi of Ekron must have been captured some time between these
dates, likely a few years before 701.

Some scholars have doubts about the genuineness of Rabshakeh's
propaganda speech. Honor (pp. 52-55) analyzes this lecture.
He says if it is not the actual speech its author was a truly
great artist. Ghirshman says this speech presents the essence
of Assyrian imperial theory. 58 It fits into the situation so
well it is easier to consider it as true rather than made up later.

2 Kings 20:20, 2 Chronicles 32:2-6, and Isa. 22:9-11 describe
Hezekiah's preparations for defense of Jerusalem. These passages
supplement each other. Chronicles says they stopped up the foun-
tain. Isaiah says, "ye gathered together the waters of the
lower pool and ye made a ditch between the walls for the waters
of the old pool." Kings says he made a pool and a conduit and
brought water into the city. The famous Siloam inscription
describes the digging of the tunnel. City water was supplied by
cisterns so the Virgin's Fountain was used to irrigate the gardens
in the Kidron valley. Hezekiah abolished this irrigation system
and cut an aqueduct through the ridge carrying the water of the
Fountain inside the city. He walled in the Tyroean valley thus
creating the area of "between the walls." 59

Montgomery 60 calls attention to an article by R. P. Dougherty
"Sennacherib and the Walled Cities of Judah" 61 which points out
some interesting features of the Assyrian campaign. Arduous
methods were necessary in order to take the fortified cities of
Judah. The cities were small but were protected by strong walls.
They were captured by the use of earthen ramps, the onslaught of
siege engines, attack by soldiers storming on foot, and by tunnelling and cutting breaches. (this is told in Sennacherib's record, cf. Col. III, lines 20-23). The cities were not completely wrecked, however. The thick walls were not levelled to the ground.

Three kinds of attack are depicted in the bas reliefs. Heaps of earth were erected against walls so that the siege engines might be taken up the inclined planes. Next came troops storming on foot. Soldiers skilled in use of sword, javelin, and bow carried the attack. Then operations of tunnelling, cutting, and breaching were begun by men equipped with shovels, picks, axes, and grappling hooks.

The attack on Judean cities was unique in its thoroughness. No other onslaught mentioned in Assyrian annals is more complete.

Archeology has confirmed the fact that the Palestinian cities had thick walls.

Section 6. The Payment of Tribute by Manasseh to Assyria

We should expect that Judah would remain tributary to Assyria after Sennacherib's invasion, though the Bible accounts of Manasseh's reign do not give much indication of it, except the captivity of Manasseh mentioned in the book of Chronicles. This will be discussed in the next contact. Driver calls attention to the fact that the subjection of Judah to Assyria may be alluded to in Nahum 1:13 and 15. We should expect such an allusion when the Hebrew prophet proclaimed the overthrow of Nineveh if Judah really were subject to Assyria. And we know the domination of Nineveh over the little Hebrew country to be a fact.

The Assyrian records prove that Judah paid tribute to Assyria during Manasseh's reign. Nearhaddon reports that twenty-two
kings of the Hittite land brought building material for restoration of the palace at Nineveh in three inscriptions. In two of these the names of the kings are given: Prism B (TE 1929-10-121) Col. V 54- VI 1; and Prism B. Col. V 1-37. The former is longer, gives more details, so I have used that as the Assyrian source. The list of kings in each are identical. Prism A Col. IV 49 ff. in an account of the restoration of the palace mentions the giving of orders to the twenty-two kings of the Hittite land, but does not list the names of the kings. The three accounts must be of the same event.

Twelve of these kings are from Syria and ten from Cyprus. It is a very impressive list. Note that Esarhaddon designates the domain of every king as a city. So it cannot be of any special significance that Manasseh is called king of the city of Judah.

The description of the twenty-two kings as from Hatti (the Hittite-land) is a phrase generally used by the Assyrians, for Western Asia. It included Phoenicia, Palestine, and adjoining countries. 63

Ashurbanipal reports that while he was on his way to Egypt in his first campaign he called on twenty-two kings of the seacoast and islands to bring tribute to him and he made these kings accompany the Assyrian army with their armies and their ships. (Rassam Cylinder Col. I 68-74). In Cylinder C, another report of the same campaign, he tells us that twenty-two kings brought tribute to him in the course of the campaign, and he lists the kings.

I do not think the account as given in the Rassam Cylinder necessarily means that Manasseh was called upon to furnish ships,
as Fuller says and cites other authorities for the same view. There is no evidence that Judah possessed any kind of a navy. But the coast cities of Tyre, Byblos, and others would have ships, as well as the cities of Cyprus, no doubt. Manasseh must have supplied some troops, however.

Here is good evidence that Ashurbanipal did interfere in Judah to a great extent in his first Egyptian campaign, which shows it is likely that he, and Esarhaddon also, in other campaigns, in which they passed near Judah, caused some disturbance in Manasseh's realm. Such interferences may well have been in part the cause of an anti-Assyrian reaction in Judah, which caused Manasseh's captivity.

Ashurbanipal designated the domain of each vassal king as a country whereas, as we pointed out above, Esarhaddon called each king's domain a city. I suppose this difference in the account of the two Assyrian kings is due to the differing practice of the scribes concerned.

The twenty-two kingdoms in the lists of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal are identical. The kings also are identical except in two places - Beth Ammon and Arvad. Amminadib succeeded Baudi at the former, and Iakinlu succeeded Matan-ba'il at the latter.

In regard to the receipt for tribute from Palestine, Waterman notes that the tribute is from the autonomous nations of Palestine; so is to be dated in the period between Sargon and Esarhaddon, which makes it very likely the tribute came from Manasseh.

Section 7. The Carrying of Manasseh to Babylon and his Return

The only source for this event is three verses in Chronicles -
2 Chronicles 33:11-13. The fact that it has no other source puts it in a very doubtful category for many scholars, and clear beyond the pale of authenticity for others of them. However, there are also many of them who accept the source as genuine.

One argument against the affair is the lack of any mention of it in 2 Kings. Obviously it very well could have been recorded there. The significance of the fact that 2 Kings is silent on this matter must be ascertained by an analysis of the materials found in Kings and Chronicles. It will be sufficient for our purpose if we confine ourselves to the accounts of the kings who reigned in Jerusalem after Solomon. They ruled only over Judah as Manasseh did. An examination of the records of each of these rulers in both Kings and Chronicles reveals that in almost every case, the report in the former is supplemented by the account in the latter book. There are only three exceptions to this rule; the cases involving kings Jehoshaz and Jehoiachin, each of whom only reigned three months and did not have time to do much, and in the case of Zedekiah, the last king, most of whose reign was spent in Jerusalem under siege, so that he did not have a chance to do anything worthy of note.

On the other hand no event recorded about any of these rulers in the book of Kings is ever omitted in Chronicles except in two cases: that of Jehoiachin - 2 Kings 24:2 mentions that bands of Chaldeans, Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites raided Judah during his reign. Chronicles does not say anything about this. And in the case of Zedekiah - 2 Kings 25:4-7 tell of his personal fate after the capture of Jerusalem. Chronicles is silent on this.

Furthermore, we would not know much about such an important
king as Jehoshaphat if we had only the Kings records. We are
just told of his dealings with Ahab of Israel, the facts that
he made peace with Israel; that he put away the Sodomites still
left in the land, and that he made an unsuccessful attempt to
sell ships from Ezion-geber, and refused to work with Ahaziah.
Ahab's son, on this venture. (1 Kings 21 & 22:41-50) Also very
meagre information is given about Azariah in this source. Only
that he built Elath and restored it to Judah, and that Yahweh
smote him with leprosy (2 Kings 14:21,22, 15:1-7). He reigned
fifty-five years and these two events are all that Kings gives
us of him.

Besides this we must consider that some events that seem
important are mentioned only in Chronicles. Zerah, the Ethiopian,
invaded Judah with a huge army, but Asa, king of Judah, defeated
him (2Chronicles 14:9-15). This is the only time the Hebrews
ever defeated the troops of a great power.66 I understand that
this event is accepted as historical by most scholars today.
Zerah probably was Asa (II called the Ethiopian by anticipation
as the next dynasty (XXIII) was Ethiopian.67 Asa was a good king,
one would think that the book of Kings would give him credit for
this victory, but it mentions it not at all. Amaziah of Judah
hired a large number of warriors from Israel for a hundred talents
of silver, and then gave them up at the behest of a prophet, losing
his money. (2 Chr. 25:6-10). Jehoaz killed the prophet Zechariah
for rebuking him. (2 Chr. 24:20,21). The book of Kings is silent
on these. The writers of Kings had a prophetic attitude, from
their point of view the fact that Amaziah after his victory over
the Edomites, carried home their gods and bowed down and worshipped
them would seem important. But, though Kings mentions the victory, it omits this apostasy.

This data ought to be sufficient to show us that the fact that Kings is silent on Manasseh's captivity has no significance.

But it is maintained that this sort of thing, Manasseh's captivity, is just the kind of an affair the writer of Kings would have recorded if it really had happened. If this wicked king, after a long and prosperous reign, was really punished for his sins, the Kings writer would surely have noted it because his philosophy was - a wicked life brings punishment, a good life brings reward. If he always wrote consistently with this attitude why did he handle a good king like Azariah in such summary fashion? He says he did right and Yahweh smote him with leprosy. It seems that Kings ought to have told some more about the good deeds of this ruler. Jehoshaphat is another case similar to Azariah. Consider the terse handling the book of Kings gives the important kings of Israel, Omri and Jeroboam II. I do not think we can predicate anything about why the writers of Kings wrote the way they did. The fact that Kings is silent on Manasseh's captivity is still unsolved but without significance for this discussion.

As sources for information about Manasseh and his reign the book of Kings mentions the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah. (This, of course, has nothing to do with our present book of Chronicles, which was not in existence when Kings was written.) Chronicles cites the book of the Kings of Judah, perhaps meaning our present book of Kings, and he also cites the sayings of Hosea (11:7, 21). This is a proper name. We do
not know anything further about such a source as this. It was probably just another document the chronicler had access to which has long since perished.

Along with Manasseh's return from captivity the chronicler records his repentance and his efforts to undo his wicked work. The fact that both in the books of Kings and of Jeremiah Manasseh is held in the utmost reprobation is claimed to indicate he never repented. The case against this king in these books is that he caused the people to sin; he led them so long in wicked ways that there was no longer any hope of them turning from them in an effective way. The abominable heathen practices the Judeans indulged at the time of the Babylonian captivity are revealed in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. They did these things after passing through Josiah's reformation, and the wonderful passover they celebrated with him. Thus we are shown how prone they were to do these wicked things. Manasseh's repentance and efforts to lead the people back to the right ways of worship were ineffective. They were not a sufficient influence to do any lasting good. So the king's personal reformation was not of any importance in the history of Judah. That is why Manasseh is held in such low esteem by the writer of Kings and Jeremiah.

It has been held that his captivity and release would have tended to increase rather than diminish Manasseh's loyalty to things foreign. Not necessarily. It would depend on what he saw and felt there; how he was treated. The Chronicler notes he was in affliction. We don't know why the king of Assyria bound him in chains and carried him away. Perhaps the king of Judah was unjustly suspected of conspiracy against Assyria.
The treatment he received may have turned him against his tormentors. But he swore allegiance to the king of Assyria and was released. If Manasseh was conspiring against Assyria, that indicates he was already turning against that land. His capture made him submit for awhile but not for long. Perhaps the Assyrian king had no one else to set up as ruler over Judah who would be more satisfactory than Manasseh, so sent him back. We cannot say for sure that his captivity would increase his loyalty to Assyria, all the evidence we have indicates that his loyalty was diminished.

There are some things in the story of this incident that indicate why it is not an imaginary tale with no basis in fact. The chronicler must have known that Manasseh was king during the time the Assyrian empire flourished, otherwise he would not have said that the king of Assyria, or his officer, took Manasseh. The kings of Assyria had Nineveh for their capital. One would naturally think the Judean king would be taken to Nineveh. This is indicated by the fact that some modern scholars substitute Nineveh for Babylon in the text because they say it is natural to expect Nineveh there. But instead Babylon is the destination of the captured king. That is unnatural. It is not likely the chronicler would have said Babylon if he was imagining the whole story. Rather he did the unnatural thing and put Babylon as the destination because he had a record of that fact to tell him so.

Moreover, it is one thing to have Manasseh carried away; it is another to have him sent back. The chronicler would know of at least two kings who were carried off. Jehoahaz who was taken to Egypt by Necho, and Jehoiachin who was carried to Babylon by
Nebuchadnezzar. These kings did not come back, they died in exile. Why did he not leave Manasseh to die in exile too? How could he ever conceive that a king bound in chains and carried away for punishment would be sent back home? Modern scholars could not conceive of such a thing until they found evidence for it elsewhere. But the chronicler did not know of any such evidence. I think if the whole affair was imaginary we would read that Yahweh punished wicked king Manasseh by causing the king of Assyria to carry him away in chains to Nineveh where he died. The way it actually reads it cannot be imaginary.

We know from Assyrian inscriptions that Manasseh paid tribute to Assyria. One record tells that he with other kings brought building material to Nineveh for Nargaraddon's palace. Perhaps he went to that city personally that time. If the account of his captivity is a confused report of this tribute journey then the destination would have been Nineveh not Babylon. This indicates it is not a confused record of that trip to bring tribute.

From the Assyrian inscriptions we know it is perfectly possible for Manasseh to be carried to Babylon instead of Nineveh. Nargaraddon rebuilt Babylon and took great pride in it, he loved to dwell there. Ashurbanipal, after he had put down the rebellion of his brother Shamash-shum-ukin at Babylon in 648 B.C., took strict charge of Babylon and might have received the Judean king there then or later.

The fact that Manasseh's captivity is not mentioned in the Assyrian records is not surprising as he was only a minor vassal king and may have been in a group rather than by himself when he appeared before the king of Assyria. Also the fact that there
is no mention of who ruled Judah while Manasseh was in captivity is not be wondered at. The important factor is that Manasseh was restored to his throne. This made it unnecessary to mention anyone ruling while he was away. If the Judean king had not been restored then his successor on the throne would have been worth mentioning.

Although we know of no direct reference to Manasseh's captivity in Assyrian inscriptions, we do have a most remarkable parallel incident recorded for us in the annals of Ashurbanipal. On the famous Rassam Cylinder Col. II lines 5-19 the Assyrian king tells us about it as follows:

"They brought these kings who had plotted evil against the army of Assyria before me at Nineveh. From among their number I had mercy on Hecho and spared his life. I imposed upon him a more severe oath than formerly. I clothed him in bright colored apparel and put on him a golden chain as the symbol of his royalty. I gave him an iron girdle dagger which was set in gold, having written my name on it. I presented him with chariots, horses, and mules for his royal riding. My officials I sent with him, at his request, as agents. I restored him to his position in Sais where my father had appointed him king; and his son, Nahu-shezibanni, I set up over Hathariba. I showed him greater favor than my father had done."69

Just before this quotation we are informed that the Assyrian officials in Egypt had discovered the conspiracy of these kings against Assyria and seized them and bound them hand and foot with bonds and fetters of iron. This incident is analogous to the affair with Manasseh. It proves that the restoration of the
Judean king was possible. Sometimes it was the policy of Assyrian kings to conciliate certain captured kings. In the case of Necho probably Ashurbanipal had no one else to set up as ruler in Sais. That may have been the situation also in regard to Manasseh.

Now that we have examined the event in all its ramifications, it is interesting to consider what various scholars say about it.

Some deny it entirely; Eduard Meyer - "It is inconceivable that this silly story should still find believers." (Geschichte des Altertums Vol. III p. 78 n. 1). Renan calls Manasseh's captivity a fable because there is no mention of it in Assyrian annals. His tribute paying implies obedient vassalage. (History of the people of Israel p. 114-115). Robinson - Manasseh's tribute made the tradition of his journey to Nineveh, later it was changed in legend to his captivity to Babylon. His restoration lends suspicion. Who ruled while he was gone? No account of an invasion of Judah by Assyria exists, so the story is not true. (A History of Israel Vol. I p. 400-401). Fuller discusses the evidence and concludes that the incident does not in any case depend upon a historical event for a fulfillment of its purpose. (Reign of Manasseh p. 65 ff.)

Some admit it was possible but are doubtful that it happened. Driver - "In regard to the captivity and return of Manasseh - the inscriptions do not decide the question, they show the event was possible. The parallel case of Necho of Sais shows it might have happened." (in Hogarth Authority and Archeology p. 115 ffl.). Peake agrees with Driver on Manasseh's captivity. (Dictionary of the Bible Vol. III p. 229 ff.) Kittel - it is not necessary to consider the account (of Manasseh's captivity)
as written to balance his long and peaceful reign with theological requirements. The story of Necho allows one to believe it.

We know that there were some troubles in Palestine during the reign of Manasseh and it would have been desirable that the great king wished Manasseh to appear. The basis for the story in Chronicles might be that Ashurbanipal seized Manasseh because he let himself be drawn in to the insurrection of Shamash-shum-ukin. With the insecurity of relations in Palestine the variations in the personal attitude of Manasseh would be well known. These factors taken together show that the account is absolutely creditable. (But Kittel puts a question mark after this incident in the table of contents.) (Geschichte de Volkes Israel Vol. II p. 525 ff.)

Some accept it as a fact. Olmstead - "Manasseh paid for his pro-Egyptian treason to Assyria by a term of imprisonment in Babylon." (E. A. p. 334) Cooke - "Ashurbanipal’s treatment of Necho of Egypt makes the capture and return of Manasseh creditable. .... Manasseh must have pledged allegiance to Assyria before Nebuchadnezzar had him return."

(C. A. N. Vol. III p. 393). Curtis and Nadesan accept Manasseh’s captivity and restoration as historical. (Chronicles of I. C. C. p. 493). Schrader was probably the first to declare this event historical on the basis of Necho’s treatment by Ashurbanipal. He puts Manasseh’s captivity under Ashurbanipal in 647 B. C. after the revolt of Babylon was quelled. Then the Assyrian king might have received him at Babylon. He cites the Necho episode. There was a revolt in Amurru and west country under Ashurbanipal, maybe Manasseh was implicated in it. Necho was treated as cruelly as Manasseh before his
release. He quotes Ashurbanipal's Annals, The Cuneiform Inscriptions
and the Old Testament translated from the second enlarged German edition
by Whitehorse Vol. II, p. 53 ff. Winckler formerly held Driver's
view but later places Manasseh's captivity in Esarhaddon's reign.
"Manasseh was summoned before Esarhaddon early in his reign,
before whom he defended his conduct and was acquitted, whether
the investigation was held in Assyria or at Babylon is difficult
to determine." (Keilinschriften und Alte Testament Vol. III
p. 274 quoted in Chronicles of I. C. C., p. 498). Sayce - "If
Manasseh had been conspiring to revolt from Assyria it would be
likely that he would be taken away into captivity; many other
princes of his time were" and "what happened to Necho could
happen to Manasseh, so the latter's captivity and return is vindica-
ted as historical." (The Higher Criticism and the Monuments
pp. 459 and 461). McCurdy - Manasseh's captivity occurred
under Ashurbanipal because there was no opportunity or possibility
of Manasseh being anti-Assyrian under Esarhaddon. Manasseh
probably was in league with Arab tribes for which Ashurbanipal
punished him. McCurdy substitutes Nineveh for Babylon in the
story. He says the Babylon reading was the natural mistake of
the writer or some copyist. (History, Prophecy, and the Monuments
(Vol. II p. 377 ff.). Cheyne cites Schrader. He says there are
inscriptions to prove Ashurbanipal received both kings and ambassa-
dors in Babylon. (647 B. C.) He cites the case of Necho; no
books were used on Necho. (in Encyclopedia Biblica Vol. III
Col. 2926 ff.). Hall says of Manasseh's captivity "there can be
little doubt that the account in Chronicles is a piece of genuine
history, though it is not in the book of Kings." (Ancient History

Olmstead - "After conquering Egypt Esarhaddon returned to capture Askelon and to carry Manasseh captive to Babylon where he (Esarhaddon) loved to dwell. Probably other captives went with Manasseh. According to Assyrian custom Manasseh was released, after being chastened by a term of imprisonment, to his throne." "Isaiah's prophecy (Isa. 7:8b.)" within 65 years shall Ephraim be broken to pieces so that it shall not be a people" given in time of Pekah's invasion of Judah, 65 years later is the time of Esarhaddon. Maybe the prophecy was fulfilled when he took Manasseh to Babylon along with other captives." (E. P. S. p. 486). This same idea expressed by Olmstead is also given by Delitzsch in his commentary on Isaiah.70 But 'Ephraim' cannot mean 'Judah.' It is never applied to the southern kingdom. The prophecy referred to therefore cannot apply to Manasseh's captivity, even if the time element should coincide with this event.

The citations from these scholars show that they are divided on the question of which king of Assyria was involved in Manasseh's captivity, Esarhaddon or Ashurbanipal. This also means there is no agreement on the conditions causing the captivity. Because of this there is no certainty of the date of the incident. But such uncertainties do not detract from the fact that the event actually happened. It is the normal situation when no decisive evidence is available to indicate the accessories to the fact.71

Section 8. The Later Resettlement of Samaria

The only evidence for colonization of Samaria after the time of Sargon (705 B. C.) is found in the three verses given as the
source, Ezra 4:2, 9, 10. This is the only passage in the Old Testament which names these two Assyrian kings, Nearhaddon in verse 2 and Asnapper in verse 10 which almost everyone believes to be Ashurbanipal. This identification is not certain, however. Some think it may be the title of an officer. But I think the fact that he is called "the great and noble" indicates a king is meant. The Lucianic text has Shalmaneser. The name is more like Ashurbanipal than the name of any other king, so it is generally believed to be him. There is no question about the name Nearhaddon in verse 2.

From verse 1 we understand the people whom Nearhaddon settled as the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin. These were the Samaritans. They cannot be the people mentioned in 2 Kings 17:24 ff. as those were settlers that Sargon brought in. We are not told from whence Nearhaddon brought colonists to Samaria. So we have no way of knowing. They became mixed in with the people previously settled and in due time became Samaritans along with all the rest of the population.

A list of names is given in verse 9 of the peoples whom Asnapper (Ashurbanipal) is said to have brought in. Some of these names are of uncertain meaning, others are known. The first name is \( \chi^2 \) Dinaites their identification is uncertain. The Lucianic recension of the Septuagint has \( \kappa \rho \iota \tau \varepsilon \) 'judges,' as if pointed \( \chi^2 \). That is no help in identification, for from whence did the 'judges' come? The second name is \( \chi^2 \) Apharsathchites. Various suggestions have been made as to whom this name or title might apply. No such tribe as this has yet been discovered. Rawlinson considered it might mean the Persians,
but other scholars assert that the Assyrians were never in a
situation in which they could obtain colonists from Persia.
F. Delitzsch suggests the Apharsathohites may be the inhabitants
of Partakka or Partukka, both of these were cities of the Medes
mentioned in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon. They are not named
in the records of Ashurbanipal, or any other Assyrian king.
Also, perhaps the meaning of the term is some king of officers
under Darius. 73 Brown Driver and Briggs Lexicon translates the
word as 'generals.' If Delitzsch is right, it is interesting
to notice Esarhaddon says he carried off the inhabitants of those
cities to Assyria. 74 The next name is ৎ searchable Tarpeites.
There are various theories about these people also. Rawlinson
identifies them with the Tuplai, a name appearing in inscriptions
as equivalent to the Greek ΤὴΒαργνοῖ, a tribe on the coast of
Pontus. Hitzig locates them in Tripolis in northern Phoenicia.
I do not see how the Tuplai could be right, the Assyrians never
captured any people as far north as Pontus. This would not apply
to Hitzig's location of them however. The fourth name is 佻 searchable
Apharsites, which may be the same as Apharsathohites the second
name, discussed above. Some have suggested it applies to a
Median tribe mentioned in the inscriptions of Sennacherib as
dwellers in the district of Parsua. 75 Sargon also mentions them.
They were confederate with Elam in battles against Assyria.
The meaning "secretaries" is given in Ezra of I. C. C. p. 165.
The fifth name is 佻 searchable Archevites. These are the people of
Ezech in Babylonia. The first certain identification.
The next name is 佻 searchable Babylonians which, of course,
is well known. The next name 佻 searchable Shushanchites, who
came from Shushan in Elam. The seventh name is \(\chi \omega \nu \gamma \) Dehaites. Their identification is uncertain.\(^77\) But Olmstead says they are from the Dahha tribe in the area of Elam.\(^78\) However, codex Vaticanus has this name as if \(\chi \omega \nu \gamma \) "that is." Coming between the Shushanchites and the Elamites that text would read like this, "the Shushanchites, that is, the Elamites."\(^79\) So it matters not whether the codex Vaticanus or Olmstead is right it all comes out to the same area. The last name is \(\chi \omega \nu \gamma \) the well known Elamites.

For those peoples discussed above whose identification remains uncertain some scholars have suggested identifications which are phonetically impossible and therefore are of no help in solving the problems involved. I have omitted the mention of such theories.

The phrase \(\mu \nu \lambda \gamma \kappa \tau \) "beyond the River" means all the countries west of the Euphrates, includes everything up to Egypt at this period.\(^80\)

The word \(\mu \nu \lambda \gamma \kappa \tau \), literally, 'and like now,' is the term used to introduce the body of the letter.

The Shushanchites, the Dahha, and the Elamites were no doubt, deported by Ashurbanipal after his conquest of Elam,\(^81\) 639 B.C. He must have brought in the Babylonians some time after 648 when he succeeded in putting down the rebellion of his brother Shamash-shum-ukin, in Babylon. There was no reason to deport people from that city or country before that uprising.

Almost any of the Assyrian kings from Sargon on down might have sent colonists to Samaria from Babylonia. They all had trouble with that country. However, none of them would have
been so apt to deport Elamites and their neighbors as Ashurbanipal. This is a factor in determining whether or not Assapper is supposed to mean Ashurbanipal.

Evidently new people were being brought in to live in Samaria off and on for about eighty years. The Samaritans certainly were a mixture of nationalities. No wonder the relatively homogeneous and old established Judeans were offended by the heterogeneous mass of newcomers who were their northern neighbors.
CHAPTER III

INFLUENCES OF ASSYRIA ON JUDAH

Section 1. The Religious and Economic Features of Manasseh's Reign

The difference between Manasseh and his father Hezekiah in religious outlook is remarkable. The power of Yahwism reached great heights in the latter's reign through outstanding deliverance from Assyrian danger. However, this probably only affected the people in the city of Jerusalem as they alone experienced the deliverance. The rural and village folk must have suffered terribly during Sennacherib's campaign. Even though the city must have been crowded with refugees at the time who enjoyed safety and rejoiced in the blessings of Yahweh, they had to go back home afterwards. The wreckage and ruin they found at home probably cooled considerably their enthusiasm for Yahwism.

Then also, Hezekiah may not have lived long after this great event; and the power of his strong personality was lost. Perhaps the triumphant preaching of the mighty prophet Isaiah was cut off quite soon also. So the forces of orthodox Yahwism lost their leadership.

No doubt there were many people who resented part of Hezekiah's reforms such as taking away the high places. They had been used to worshipping Yahweh at these sites, and they did not like being deprived of them. Probably as soon as Hezekiah was gone they went back to this worship. Rebuilding the high places is mentioned as the first thing Manasseh did when he came to the throne. He was only twelve years of age, too young to appreciate the blessings of the great victory of Yahwism. Also he was too young to prevent the people from going back to illegitimate worship, rather he went along with them. Though this was worship of the
true God it was prone to take on accretions of heathenism.
Baalism in particular. That was why the forces of orthodox Yahweh
worship were against it.

If Manasseh began to reign soon after the Sennacherib's
invasion there was no doubt still plenty of evidence of the damage
still around. The youthful ruler would be impressed by the power
of Assyria. He was surrounded with the influences of that empire,
he was part of it. Heavy and costly tribute must have gone from
Judah to Assyria every year. By the time he was old enough to
step out and assert himself Manasseh must have made up his mind
that the greatest power in his world was Assyria.

There is some evidence that subject states were required to
pay ritual dues for Ashur and Belit and the god of Assyria by
Ashurbanipal. Montgomery points out that Luckenbill's A. R. A. II
par. 798 says this, though Schrader translates differently
Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek II p. 195, as of imposition of
cults. 62 This would give added impetus to Manasseh's participa-
tion in heathen practices.

The accounts of him in 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles are con-
cerned only with his religious abominations, except Chronicles
add some other details about his captivity, return, repentence
and building. Judah being in subjection, there probably was not
much else going on that was worth mentioning.

The Kings and Chronicles accounts of his religious abomina-
tions are very much alike, the same words are used to describe
them. The first thing he did was to build up the high places
his father had torn down. He set up the high places with all
their equipment of pillars, poles, and altars. He raised up an
altar for Baal the chief god of the Canaanites. He made an
Asherah symbol, which was a tree trunk or a pole regarded as
sacred, embodying the presence of the goddess. He worshipped
and served all the host of heaven, all the heavenly bodies, sun,
moon, stars and planets. He observed their movements and guided
his activity by them. He believed the heavenly bodies had power
to work in his life. He made an altar to some god other than
Yahweh. The Bible accounts emphasize the enormity of this act
by reminding us that this was the place where Yahweh had put his
name. It belonged to him alone. He built altars in the two
courts of the temple for all the host of heaven. These altars
had to be out in the open under the sky. This was a character-
istic Babylonian and Assyrian cult. 2 Kings 23:11 mentions horses
given to the sun, and chariots of the sun also. These must have
been used in some way in worship of the sun, perhaps they were
driven out every morning to welcome the sun. They were kept at
the entrance to the temple. There may have been images or
idols used in worship of the heavenly bodies such as symbol
of the signs of the Zodiac. 83

Verse 6 in both accounts lists heathen practices which
Manasseh indulged in and which were expressly forbidden to the
Hebrews in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. He caused his son to
pass through the fire. Whatever this means, it is connected with
Moloch worship in the Bible. Lev. 18:21, 2 Kings 23:10, Jer. 32:35.
Moloch was the god of the Ammonites. 2 Kings 11:7, 12:13. Opinions
differ as to what the practice of this rite consisted of. Some
say it means Manasseh sacrificed his son to Yahweh. 84 This is
hardly consistent with the Bible assigning this ceremony to
Moloch worship. Driver more correctly says it means he sacrificed his son to Moloch.\textsuperscript{65} Sayce says the first-born were burnt alive.\textsuperscript{66} This might have been done in connection with Moloch worship. Montgomery says this was a holocaust, not a symbolic rite; he cites the words of Josephus \textit{ἐγὼν ἀνθρώπος παλεύει}. Such fire-immolation was symptomatic of the general breakdown of the religion of the small states of the day under the pressure of Assyria. He notes that the sacrifice is 'to Molek' in 2 Kings 23:10.\textsuperscript{67} Ahas had done this abomination before, 2 Kings 16:3.

Next comes a list of Hebrew words that denote various heathen practices. \textit{ילוננו} 'he practiced soothsaying.' This word means a divination of an uncertain king. Some suggest bewitching, an evil eye.\textsuperscript{68} It may denote a king of 'anguary.' Dhorme explains it as coming from \textit{ плохо} 'cloud' meaning 'cloud observer.'\textsuperscript{69} \textit{מעיצ} 'he used enchantments' or he observed 'omens.' Natural omens like the flight of birds, or like watching the play of light and rings in a cup of liquid. Joseph must have divined this way with his cup. (Gen. 44:15) This word also includes crystal gazing and hypnotism.\textsuperscript{90} The root idea, as in the liquid variant \textit{מעני}, is that of hissing used of magicians who squeak and gibber, it might even include serpent charmers.\textsuperscript{91} Cf. the Hebrew word for snake, \textit{מעני} the same root, so-called from its hissing. \textit{מעית} 'he practiced sorcery' superstitions use of drugs and herbs for magical effects, to mutter incantations.\textsuperscript{92} This word does not occur in the 2 Kings account.\textit{מעית קינן נきます} 'he instituted ghosts and familiar spirits,' that is, persons who professed to deal with them. Some consulted any ghost, others consult only a familiar
spirit, one with which they are acquainted." Montgomery renders this Hebrew phrase as follows: "he made 'ob and wizards'." Some insight into the meaning of the first of these terms is afforded by the case of the witch of Endor in I Sam. 28, she is called "a woman possessed by an 'ob"; and also in the way in which certain persons are described in Lev. 20:27. "a man or woman when an 'ob is in them." These references show that 'ob dwelt in and had control over a person. Isa. 29:4c is another interesting reference. "and thy voice shall be as an 'ob out of the earth." Of. also Deut. 18:11 "one who consults an 'ob." These various uses of the word indicate that 'ob means a demon or a person possessed by such. This demon, or evil spirit, had connections with the dead. Probably the best designation is a soothsaying daemon, or a person possessed by such. The same root in Hebrew means a 'bottle.' The connection may be that as a skin or leather bottle can swell or be blown out so does a possessed person puff and gasp. Or it may be that the possessed person was regarded as the bottle or container of the daemon within him. The LXX almost always renders Νἱ ζ'X by ἔγγατριάθαι 'ventriloquists.' In ancient times such persons were regarded as having daemons speak through them. 96 being derived from 'to know' undoubtedly means either the knowing ones; i. e. knowing the spirits, so rendered 'wizards,' or the known ones; i. e. known to the spirits, or the known spirits, hence translated 'familiar spirits.' ζ'X and frequently occur together;
indeed the latter is never used except with the former. Together the two words mean persons possessed by soothsaying demons and persons in communication with the spirit world. Manasseh fostered such individuals.

When an examination is made to determine where these words and phrases occur in the Bible, it is remarkable that all the practices denoted by these expressions are mentioned as being done among the Hebrews only at this period. The chief exception to this is King Saul’s affair with the witch of Endor. Ahas, king of Israel, was the first to practice some of them. Manasseh took up the same ones and initiated others into Judah. The Israelites who were carried away by Assyrians from Samaria are blamed for practicing them. Only the contemporary prophets accuse the Hebrews of doing them. Most of them are forbidden in both Leviticus and Deuteronomy. In order that these things should be clearly understood I will set forth the occurrence of these words and expressions in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbidden</th>
<th>Practiced by the Hebrews</th>
<th>Practiced by Foreigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 19:26</td>
<td>2 Ki. 21:6</td>
<td>Deut. 18:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 18:10</td>
<td>Mic. 5:11</td>
<td>Isa. 2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa. 57:3</td>
<td>Jer. 27:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Chr. 33:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Lev. 19:26 | Gen. 44:5,15 | Gen. 30:27 |
| Deut. 18:10 | 2 Ki. 17:17 | Num. 23:5,15,23 |
|            | 2 Ki. 21:5 | Num. 24:1 |
|            | 2 Chr. 33:6 | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deuteronomy 18:10</th>
<th>Micah 5:12</th>
<th>Exodus 7:11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malachi 3:5</td>
<td>2 Kings 9:22</td>
<td>Isaiah 47:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles 33:6</td>
<td>Jeremiah 27:9</td>
<td>Nahum 3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel 2:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leviticus 19:31</th>
<th>1 Samuel 28:3,7,8,9</th>
<th>Isaiah 19:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy 18:11</td>
<td>2 Kings 21:6</td>
<td>Leviticus 20:6,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy 18:11</td>
<td>2 Kings 23:24</td>
<td>Isaiah 8:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 29:4</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 10:13</td>
<td>2 Chronicles 33:6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The references in 1 Samuel & 1 Chronicles are in the story of Saul's affair with the witch of Endor:

"וַיֵּלֶךְ הָעָלהָ דִּם חִנְעָם, וַיִּקְבּוּ הַשָּׁהָ דִּם חִנְעָם, 'כִּלְכָּה דְּמֵאָה חִנְעָם,"

"he made his son pass through the fire."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forbidden by the Hebrews</th>
<th>Practiced by Foreigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus 18:21</td>
<td>2 Kings 16:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy 12:31</td>
<td>2 Kings 3:27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deut. 18:10 2 Ki. 21:6
Jer. 7:31
Jer. 19:5
2 Chr. 29:3
2 Chr. 33:6

םשנ תחתית "to worship all the host of heaven"
יכש נשה
Deut. 4:19 2 Ki. 17:16
Deut. 17:5 2 Ki. 21:3,5
Jer. 8:2
Jer. 19:13
Zeph. 1:5
2 Chr. 33:3,5

Notice that all the references in the center column come from this general period or a little later, except the passages dealing with Saul's episode with the witch of Endor. ימיע "to use enchantments" or "to divine" was indulged in by Joseph in the early days of Israel. But it is not mentioned again as being practiced until the sins of the people deported from Samaria are recited.

There is one reference each to passing sons through the fire and worshipping all the host of heaven which I have not included in the table, 2 Ki. 23:10 and 23:4,5 respectively, because these passages tell of Josiah tearing down the equipment used for these practices.

Foreign nations indulged in all these things. However, there is no mention of human sacrifice in the records of Babylonia
and Assyria.97

All of Manasseh's religious reforms were originally forbidden the Hebrews. He was reverting to old heathen practices. The impetus for worshipping the heavenly bodies undoubtedly came from Babylonia and Assyria. These people had made astrology a great art, their lives were all wrapped up in it. Omens from the heavens governed them in all their affairs.98 There are many documents that show this.99

The kings of Judah who had the most foreign relations were the greatest indulgers in these heathen cults. Ahas is a good example of this. Hezekiah had foreign relations also, but he was rebelling against the foreigner. Ahas and Manasseh were accepting things from foreigners. The contamination that always came from foreign imports was the reason why all the prophets of Yahweh condemned alliances with other nations.

As a supplement to the accounts in Kings and Chronicles the Bible gives us some more information about religious conditions in Judah in the books of the prophets. These accounts describe affairs at a later stage of history, just before the conquest of Jerusalem by Babylon, but no doubt the cults the people practiced then stemmed from Manasseh's time. According to Jer. 15:4 the sins of Manasseh were the cause of the exile. cf. 2 Ki. 21:10-15.

The eighth chapter of Ezekiel contains a report of a vision in which the prophet saw the iniquities practiced in Jerusalem. In a place in the inner recesses of the temple was a secret room on the walls of which were portrayed every form of creeping thing, and abominable beasts and all the idols of Israel. (v. 10)
Probably reptiles were represented. Likely a lot of these forms were imported from Babylon, probably from Egypt also, where animal worship was even more common. Seventy men with censers in their hands were offering incense to these forms of idols. (v. 11) Toward the north gate sat women weeping for Tammuz. (v. 14) This is the only mention of this god in the Bible. Tammuz was the lover of Ishtar, he was the god of vegetation, later known as the Greek god Adonis. Every year at the time of greatest heat, when the vegetation began to fade and die, Tammuz departed into the underworld. Every spring he returned with the vegetation. The time of his departure was celebrated by public dirges. Probably the vision of the prophet was arranged to occur at just the right time to see women weeping for the departed god. Very likely this was an annual celebration instead of an annual cycle.

About twenty-five men stood with their backs to the temple, facing the east, and they were worshipping the sun. (v. 16) This practice was probably imported from Babylon shortly before the fall of Jerusalem.

Jeremiah 44:15 ff. gives information about the practice of worshipping the Queen of Heaven. This deity is the same goddess who is called Ishtar by the Babylonians, and 'Ashtoreth of the glorious heavens' in Zidonian inscriptions. The worship of this deity - the national god of Syria according to Tertullian. Apol. XXIV - was especially cultivated by women. Ishtar was the planet Venus, and the worship was probably paid to that planet. Eusebius identifies Astarte with Venus (Præp. Evang. 1.10). Cakes were made to worship her, probably in the shape of the moon or that of a star. It may be that they were intended to be
substitutes for animals and so were made in their shape. 103

Probably the worship of this goddess through the planet Venus has some connection with the worship of all the host of heaven which Manasseh brought into Judah. This specialized worship of only one of the host of heavenly bodies may be a refinement, the result of a generation or two of development.

The Queen of Heaven is only mentioned in two passages of the Bible, Jer. 7:18, and 44:17,19,25. The glimpse these verses give us into the situation then prevailing indicate that the worship of the Queen of Heaven was vigorously prosecuted by all classes of the population, and the people had much faith in it. Such a going concern among the citizens of Judah, and no one mentions it in the Bible but Jeremiah! It must have been confined to Judah and have come into prominence shortly before the fall of Jerusalem.

There are many Hebrew manuscripts which instead of \( \text{נֵבַע} \) 'to the queen' have \( \text{נֵבַע} \) 'to the service' in the text. Very likely the former reading is original and the latter represents a toning down by exegetes of later generations. This is illustrated by the versions. The LXX, for example, though it has the former reading in Jer. 44, in 7:18 we find the phrase τῇ στρατείᾳ τοῦ δύρανος which means 'the host of heaven'. But a very similar Greek word, στρατεία means 'expedition' which is the basic meaning of \( \text{נֵבַע} \). The Syriac interprets the text this way, in both passages. But, on the other hand, the Vulgate always sticks to the \( \text{נֵבַע} \) reading. 104 Probably the reading \( \text{נֵבַע} \) came into the text long after the worship of the queen of heaven had passed out of existence among the Hebrews.

Evidently Manasseh persecuted people who stood for Yahwism.
2 K. 21:16 and the tradition that Isaiah was sawn asunder by him. This indicates a fanatical devotion to heathenism.

No doubt the Judean king was convinced that orthodox Yahwism was a nuisance. By his lights, the heathen cults were superior because they belong to the ruling power. If he filled Jerusalem with blood his persecution was no slight matter. Probably it was going on throughout his long reign. If the king had actually conducted a militant campaign against Yahweh's faithful, the matter would have received more than this incidental mention in the Bible record. Most likely the persecution was a sideline while his chief interest was in cultivating the foreign heathen cults.

The information the Scriptures give us of economic affairs in this period is confined to one verse, 2 Chr. 33:4. Some building is mentioned along with the fact that Manasseh placed captains of war in all the walled cities of Judah. These look like military measures. If this activity was subsequent to his captivity it may have been to construct a defense, as a vassal of Assyria, against Egypt. The mention of walled cities indicates more construction work had been done if these were cities destroyed by Sennacherib. No doubt considerable building operations were engaged in during this reign.

We have a hint in the Bible of an anti-Assyrian policy in the name Amon, which Manasseh gave his son. Certainly no ardent Assyrian vassal would name his son after the well known Egyptian god. The name is in good keeping with Manasseh's notorious penchant for heathen features. But he could surely have expressed himself adequately in this direction by selecting some Assyrian
appellation. Evidently the intention was that the next king of Judah should bear an Egyptian name declaring his regard for the pantheon of the nation on the Nile. Amon was twenty-two years old when his father died. If that was about 640 B.C. then Amon was born about 660. This was shortly after Ashurbanipal’s last expedition to Egypt. As seen in the section on Manasseh’s tribute paying, Judah was called on to help in these expeditions. Perhaps the Assyrians made so many demands on the king and his people that he turned against them. He would not dare express resentment publicly. Maybe he did it privately, giving his son, born about that time, an Egyptian name. This may have been kept a secret until it was safe to publicize the name. It might even have been that, having learned of this name, the Assyrians held it as a point against him. It may have been a factor in the cause of his captivity to Babylon. If Manasseh had reacted against Assyria and toward Egypt as early as 660 it would not necessarily change his attitude toward Yahwism. Egypt was just as anti-Yahweh as Assyria was. Whether or not it made any difference in his cultivation of heathen cults is not apparent.

We do not know much about Judah’s particular situation at this time, but we do know the broad overall picture. Judah was part of a great empire. For most of Manasseh’s reign all the land from the Persian gulf to the African desert was under one rule. That was a very favorable situation for peace. As far as Judah was concerned, once Egypt was conquered, there was no one to bother her. As far as we know Judah was at peace with everyone. Aside from the disruption caused by the Assyrians’ Egyptian campaigns, and whatever led up to and caused Manasseh’s
captivity, the Hebrews lived peacefully and securely. Assyria ruled over all her neighbors; even the raiding Arabs were checked.

Judah had more relationships with Samaria than with any other country. Various waves of new and strange settlers were being brought into that land as we have seen. This was bound to have some effect on Judah.

Trade must have flourished more or less unhindered. This brought prosperity. Probably much wealth came into Jerusalem. Part of it would go out in tribute to Assyria, but some remained and accumulated every year.

That is the general picture. For specific information on certain places we must turn to archeology.

Megiddo is situated far from Judah in northern Samaria. But what was found there may be taken as illustrative of what happened in other places. This city was in an area devastated by Tiglath Pileser III in 733 but was made the capital of a province soon after, so it must have been rebuilt very quickly. Two governors of it are mentioned in inscriptions. Stratum III contents are Israelite. Stratum II contents are Assyrian, which probably lasted until 609 after the defeat of Josiah by Necho at Megiddo when it was destroyed.

There were no province capitals or residences of governors in Judah, so Assyrian remains would not accumulate so definitely.

Ceser is located a few miles north of Judah. Macalister excavating there found two very interesting fragments of tablets each bearing an inscription in Akkadian. They turned out to be contracts relating to the sale of real estate. They read as follows:
No. 1 tablet

Obverse
1. Seal of Naruduk-eriba, son of ......
2. Seal of Abi-eriba, son of ......
3. total, 2 men, owners of the houses, field (?) [eli sold]
4. the house of Lu-aha, to ......

[Seals]
5. The people (probably slaves) Turi-As, his two wives, his son
6. 3 men .........
7. 2 .........
8. ...........
9. ...........

Reverse
1. [The money sevenfold to their owners]
2. he shall return[ in the lawsuit he shall plead and]
3. he shall not receive. Guarantee (?) [against] sickness (?)
4. for a hundred days, physical defect (?) for all time
5. Month Sivan, day 17th eponym which is after
6. Assur-kudurru-usur, prefect of Mashalsu.
7. Before Zaggi; before Tebataa.
8. before Bel-essa-iddina; before Marduknasir;
9. before Furuasi the governor
10. before Barapi’u the commission agent;
11. before Zera-ukin, son of Tebataa;
12. before Hitadin; before Si’ 
13. before Mannu-ki-arba-ulu; before ......
14. before Zeratu.

The uncertainty of the scribe concerning the date "after
the eponymy of Assur-kudurra-usur," which was 650 B.C., shows
he evidently did not know the eponymy for 649, which was Sagabbil.109
This indicates the tablet belongs to a place distant from Nineveh,
as Cesar was.

The first names of the witnesses are Assyrian; they come
even before the name of the governor, which is Egyptian. This
indicates the Assyrians had precedence over Egyptians at this time.

Translation of No. 2 Tablet

Obverse

1. The seal of Natan-Iau (Nethaniah)
2. the owner of the field made over
3. (area) of field next Sini
4. ...............next Sini
5. .................

Reverse

1. in the presence of .......
2. in the presence of Bu-sik-...-is
3. in the presence of Zer-ukin
4. in the presence of Nergal-šar-usur
5. in the month Shebat, fourth day

Lower Edge

1. Eponymy of Ahi-ilai
2. Viceroy of Garchemish

This tablet is dated 648110

A Hebrew Nethaniah sells his field which is next to that of Sini.
The paucity of tablets indicates a rather short period of Assyrian
occupation.111
These inscriptions certainly show Assyrian influence was strong at Gezer about 650 B.C. This was very close to Judah. There might have been an Assyrian garrison at or near Gezer. If so, probably Assyrian soldiers spent some time in Judah.

Samaria naturally would be more Assyrianized than Judah as she had an Assyrian governor, and many colonists from Babylonia had been brought in to live in her cities. The influence was strong for awhile, but the empire did not endure long enough to make her influence go very deep.

Section 2. Egyptian Contacts with Judah

Judah was probably the most important of the states situated between Egypt and Assyria. The nation on the Nile often was active in every possible way against the country of the two rivers. Being unable, at this period, to send forth troops across Palestine and Syria to Assyria she worked against her huge Mesopotamian rival by diplomatic means. Her agents were constantly stirring up trouble in the vassal states of Assyria. Judah was in the forefront of these uprisings.

On the other hand, the little Palestinian country was herself prone to play off Egypt against Assyria. In days gone by a king of Judah, Ahaz, had appealed to Assyria for help. But later the empire of the latter began to reach out and gobble up Samaria. Then Hoshea, king of Israel, sent to So or Sib’eh of Egypt for help. But no aid was forthcoming and Israel was conquered 721 B.C.

The next year Egyptian agents supported Hamath, Damascus and Gaza in revolt against Sargon, king of Assyria. The uprising was put down, the Egyptians were defeated at Raphia by the Assyrians.

In 714 Ashdod rebelled. Judah was implicated in the insurrection
with other Palestinian states and Egyptian agents were active in support of the revolt in all these countries. The Assyrian quickly quelled the uprising at Ashdod, and exacted tribute from Judah.

We know of all this activity of Egypt from Assyrian inscriptions. We are aware also that the Nile country continued her machinations against the empire. Not only the records of the Assyrian king but also the Hebrew Scriptures bear evidence of this. The prophet Isaiah flourished during this period, his book contains references of Judah's relations with Egyptians. The principal passages are 18:1-3; 30:1-7; and 31:1-3. (See these and other parts of the book of Isaiah discussed below in the section on the prophets.) Probably an alliance was made with Egypt some time before Sennacherib's invasion of Palestine in 701 B.C. During that invasion the Assyrians fought against two Egyptian armies. One sent by the Delta princes which was defeated near Eltekeh and the other which appeared later under the leadership of Tirhakah was driven back out of Palestine. These forces from the land of the Nile may have come out because of this alliance.

After the great experience of deliverance from the hand of the Assyrians, Judah reacted against Egypt. During the most of Manasseh's reign the little state was pro-Assyrian in policy. Later, under this same king, there is evidence of a pro-Egyptian attitude. Witness the king naming his son Amon, and also his captivity by the Assyrians which must have been caused by an anti-Assyria attitude on the part of Manasseh.

Under Josiah, who became king of Judah about 639 B.C.,
there was a reaction against Assyria. His reformation in religious practices attacked the astral cults which had come from Assyria. Olmstead cites Jeremiah 2:66 as evidence that Judah changed their foreign policy from Assyria to Egypt by 626. 112 Josiah had no doubt established his independence by this time or soon thereafter. We know from the Bible record that this king carried his religious reforms into the land of Samaria. Probably he took over control of the territory of Ephraim and Manasseh, as well as some of the Philistine cities. 113 Perhaps the whole land as far north as Riblah in the district of Hazath could be regarded as Israelite. 114

The Judean king was probably in favor of Babylon in its war against Assyria. He no doubt wished to be friendly with Egypt. 115 But he did not want this latter country to help Assyria.

This seems to be the situation back of the rather strange encounter between Necho II of Egypt and Josiah, narrated in the Bible - 2 Kings 23:29; and 2 Chronicles 35:20-24. The former account says 'In his days Pharaoh Necho, king of Egypt, went up towards the king of Assyria on the Euphrates river.' The Chronicles account says Necho was going up to fight against Carchemish which was probably the true destination of the Egyptian king. We know he was proceeding to the area to fight for the Assyrian cause against Babylonia. Josiah being aware of this, tried to stop him. The Hebrew king probably could command other than Judean forces as it was in the northern area of Megiddo that he came out against Pharaoh. 116 Necho knew that haste was essential if he was going to be of much help to Assyria, so this move by Josiah irritated him. He tried to make the king of Judah desist and
let him go about his purposes. But the Hebrew ruler would not withdraw. He was a man of convictions, when he had begun an antagonistic movement against Egypt he would stick to it. So a battle of the Egyptians against the forces of Josiah ensued. The latter were defeated, and the king of Judah was mortally wounded 608 B. C.

A. C. Welch has an interesting view of this encounter between Necho and Josiah. The Judean king was not killed in a battle at Megiddo, there is no evidence of a battle, except in the account in 2 Chronicles. The report in Kings says "and king Josiah went to meet him (Necho) and he (Necho) slew him in Megiddo when he saw him." This looks more like an execution than a battle. But why would Necho want to do away with Josiah? The Egyptian king was aware of the Judean ruler's religious campaign, and he saw that Josiah was anti-Assyrian. Furthermore Necho recognized in the Judean's activity in the area of the northern kingdom a plan to incorporate all Palestine into his kingdom. Josiah was taking advantage of Assyria's weakness to strengthen Judah. The Egyptian ruler also had his own plans. He expected to take over Syria and Palestine for himself. He saw in Josiah a dangerous obstacle to his plans. Just then Necho was in a hurry to aid Assyria before it was too late. He did not like the idea of leaving a dangerous force represented by the king of Judah in his rear but he could not take time to do anything about it. But when Josiah came out to meet him he saw his opportunity to do something about it after all. As soon as he saw the king of Judah he had him executed.

This theory is well built up. Necho's subsequent activity
in Palestine shows that he did plan to take over that area for himself. But I wonder how he could execute Josiah without a battle, especially as the Judean king had his army with him. He could direct his archers to concentrate on the king. That would be as good a method of doing away with him as any. Apparently that is what actually happened. But even if there was a battle that does not detract from the rest of the theory. Josiah was killed, Necho had accomplished his desire. It probably was not much of a conflict. As soon as the king was killed his warriors would give up the struggle. The account in 2 Chronicles makes it appear that Necho did not want to fight with Josiah. He probably did not, because he was in such a hurry to aid Assyria. If he was successful with this nation he would be in a strong position to deal with the Judean kingdom when he returned. Thus I think Welch is unjustified in rejecting the 2 Chronicles account, as it is not necessary for his theory to do so.

Necho took up his position at Riblah. The people of Judah put Josiah's son Jehoahaz, on the throne. But Necho removed him after a reign of three months and sent him to Egypt, where he later died. Then the Egyptian king made Eliakim, another son of Josiah, king of Judah, and changed his name to Jehoiachin. This change of name meant that the Judean prince was created a new person by the Pharaoh. Similarly, Nebuchadnezzar changed Mattaniah to Zedekiah. If this was the impression on people's minds, then it is easy to understand the change as a propaganda move. It would strengthen the Pharaoh in the eyes of the Judeans.

The new king was forced to pay to Egypt a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold. Necho had intentions of taking
over Assyria's empire in the west. He took advantage of his
opportunity to make a vassal state out of Judah. However, a few
years later, 605, the forces of Babylonia decisively defeated
the Egyptians at Charchemish and ended their hopes of conquest.
Babylonia took over the Assyrian empire.
Section 3. Reflections of Assyria in the Prophets

All pertinent passages occur in the book of Isaiah, most of
them refer to Sennacherib's invasion of Palestine which was a
tremendous experience for Yahweh's people. I shall examine briefly
each passage to ascertain what light it can throw on the relations
of Assyria with Judah.

Fortunately all the passages with which we have to deal are
found within the first part of the book, chapters 1-39. So we
will not have to give consideration to critical questions of
authorship and date which apply to chapters 40-66. Therefore
we can take these passages in Isaiah on their face value. That
does not mean that they are necessarily arranged in chronological
order. But for the purposes of this discussion it will be best
to examine the passages cited in the order in which they occur
in the prophecy, because the date of a passage, as it is Isaiahic,
is not important to our objective.

Sometimes Isaiah's prophecies about the Assyrians are taken
to be pro-Assyrian in part and anti-Assyrian in other parts.
That is, on some occasions Isaiah prophesied the destruction
of his own people, other times he predicted a great deliverance
for them. A change of mind on the part of the prophet is said
to be thereby indicated. But there is no necessity for calling
any of Isaiah's prophecies pro-Assyrian. The prophet regarded
Sennacherib as the instrument of God. Yahweh was using him to punish his disobedient people. This is a viewpoint characteristic of the prophets (cf. Isa. 10:5 ff., Jer. 21:10; 25:9 ff., Eze. 29:16 ff.). Passages indicating destruction of Judah do not apply to Sennacherib. Isaiah is consistently anti-Assyrian. Every time he holds up the Assyrian king as the punisher of Judah, he also sets forth the destruction of the Assyrians.


Chapter 1:7-9

This is a picture of devastation all around with the city of Jerusalem standing preserved in the midst of the wreckage. Strangers have burned the cities, devoured the land, and left it desolate (depopulated). The daughter of Zion (Jerusalem) alone is left, but in the condition of a besieged city. Yahweh of hosts preserved a small remnant of his people in the city, otherwise, the prophet says, we should all have been destroyed. This is what the situation in Judah must have been like after the Assyrian army was wiped out and Sennacherib had gone back home. He claims to have conquered 46 cities and took a huge number of captives. This passage, if it applies here, certainly substantiates his claims. Some scholars apply these verses to the situation caused by Syro-Ephraimitic War earlier in Isaiah's career. But it fits the Assyrians' invasion better, particularly the use of נָגַנְתָּי "strangers."

I regard this passage as a prediction of the Assyrian invasion.
Chapter 7:17-25

This passage is definitely a prediction of Assyria and the invaders are named. The Assyrians and Egyptians shall be like bees and flies for number and shall shave the country clean. Verses 21-25 describe conditions of famine and sparse population caused by the intruders.

The mention of Egypt indicates that this is a prophecy of the wars between that land and Assyria which shall shave Judah clean. It indicates that the successive Assyrian campaigns against Egypt, and finally Pharaoh Necho's depredations in Judah before he was defeated at Carchemish by the Babylonians in 605, as well as Semacherib's invasion of Palestine, had a devastating effect on Judah.

Chapter 10:5-34

In this passage the prophet gives the divine explanation of why the king of Assyria was invading Judah. I believe this prophecy was given soon after Rabshekhah's speech at Jerusalem's wall to demoralize the distressed people into surrender. Therefore, the prophet alludes to some of that speech in vs. 9-11.

The destruction of the Assyrian forces is predicted in vs. 16-19, and 26-27. Verses 28-34 depict the route of the invaders, but we know it is not the route the Assyrians actually took. However, if the Assyrians had come down from the north this is the route they would take, a difficult one but well suited for a surprise. These verses give an extremely vivid account of how the Assyrians may be expected to come, advancing steadily almost up to Jerusalem and then they are cut down right outside the city. Working up
to an abrupt climax this way, the prophet is able to set forth the emotional effect of the people, which he could not have secured by describing the unusual way in which the Assyrians actually came. It is a fitting close of this recitation of Yahweh's view of the situation to bring home to his people with force the sudden destruction of the Assyrians, which emotional shot the bedraggled Judeans needed to face the crisis.

Chapter 14:24-27

This short passage at first sight seems out of place right after a prophecy dealing with Babylon. But this reference as to what Yahweh was going to do to Assyria upon the mountains of Judah was a pledge of what he was going to do to Babylon later. The actual destruction of Assyria is depicted in verse 25. The context afforded by verses 24, 26 and 27 indicate that the breaking and treading down of Assyria is an example of how Yahweh carries out his purposes in the earth. This emphasizes the fact of the destruction of Sennacherib's army.

Chapter 17:12-14

This passage seems to apply to the Assyrians, their empire was made up of many nations. It may be a reference to the event after it happened to set it forth as an example of the fate of the enemies of God's people. Verse 14 very tersely indicates the suddenness of the destruction, "in the evening trouble, and before morning he is gone."
Chapter 18:1-7

Ethiopia, which ruled Egypt at this time, sent ambassadors to Judah. But Isaiah calls their attention, and the attention of all the world, to what Yahweh is going to do to Assyria. He will let her roll on until the very last moment then cut her off. This so impresses the Ethiopian ambassadors that they will honor Yahweh by bringing presents to him. The implication being that Judah does not need Ethiopia's aid. Probably that nation really did send ambassadors to Hezekiah sometime during the crises with Assyria, and Isaiah used this event to emphasize the great work Yahweh would do to deliver Judah. This fits in with what we know of Egyptian intrigue with Judah from Assyrian records.

Chapter 28:1-29

Most scholars consider that this chapter refers to a covenant Judah made with Egypt. This might be the case, as we know from Assyrian records that Judah was indeed allied with surrounding kings and with Egypt against Assyria during Hezekiah's reign. However, we also know from the Bible record (2 Kings 16:7-9) that king Ahaz made a covenant with Assyria, and Judah was trusting in this covenant to protect them. This was prior to their leasing toward Egypt. Verses 1-4 indicate Samaria was not yet overthrown. So I think it more likely that this prophecy refers to Ahaz's covenant with Tiglath Pileser of Assyria; Isaiah is telling them it will not succeed. Indeed, it was a very shortsighted deal on the part of Ahaz. As a result of it the Assyrians removed Syria from their path and moved in closer to Judah. This prophecy is against the leaders of Judah but it does not predict their
destruction. It sets forth that this covenant with death will be wiped out, and the people will be punished, trodden down, for it. So this passage shows us the state of mind of Judah's leaders before Hezekiah's time. It indicates that there was a change in the policy of Judah when Hezekiah reigned.

Chapter 29:1-16

This passage describes conditions of siege and then tells that Yahweh will do away with the multitude of the enemy; they pass away as though in a dream. This fits well with the disaster that overtook the Assyrians. Sennacherib wakes up in the morning and finds his soldiers have died during the night. Judah shall be brought very low, but she is not destroyed, rather saved. Verses 9-15 the people are indifferent and do not understand or care to be enlightened in the ways of Yahweh. Verses 15, 16 refer to Ahaz's alliance with Assyria.

Chapter 30:1-17

Verses 1-7 is a prophecy against alliance with Egypt, for this nation will be of no help to Judah. Verses 8-12 people are rebellious against Yahweh. Verses 13, 14 refer to destruction of their iniquitous alliances with Egypt and with Assyria. Verse 15 invitation to trust in Yahweh. Verse 16 their refusal, they preferred to trust in swift horses. Verse 17 the result of their choice, only a remnant shall be left to them. A reference to the Assyrian invasion. Verses 18-26 refer to future blessings
and conditions.

Chapter 30:27-28

Here is a picture of the enemy, Assyria, coming up like a storm and a wrathful man, but the people shall rejoice because Yahweh shall beat him down.

Chapter 31:1-9

The prophet again admonishes the people against alliance with Egypt because Yahweh says he will defend Jerusalem and cause the Assyrian to fall by a sword not wielded by human hands. It indicates Sennacherib fled in fear back to Nineveh.

Chapter 32:1-14

Verses 1-14 may refer to the effect on Judean society of the deliverance from Assyrian, then the destruction mentioned in v. 14 would be the Babylonian conquest under Nebuchadnezzar.

Chapter 33:1-24

The spoiler here is Sennacherib. He dealt treacherously in agreeing to accept tribute and then demanding again the surrender of Jerusalem. Conditions before and after the destroying of the Assyrians are portrayed. Verse 23 gives a graphic description of conditions in Jerusalem, the city is compared to a badly damaged ship; but after the smiting of the foe, her people,
even the lame among them, go forth to gather spoil in the Assyrian camp. Here is a detail not given anywhere else; yet it must have happened that way. A people shut up and uncomfortable in a besieged city suddenly relieved, would be expected to do that very thing.
Section 1. The Sources for the Conquest and Resettlement of Samaria

(1) The Hebrew source, 2 Kings 17: 3-6, 24

Against him came up Shalmeneser, King of Assyria, and Hoshea became his servant and paid tribute to him. (4) But the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea because he had sent messengers to So, king of Egypt and had not paid tribute to the king of Assyria every year and the king of Assyria shut him up and bound him in prison. (5) Then the king of Assyria went up through all the land and he came up to Samaria and besieged it three years. (6) In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria captured Samaria and carried away Israel to Assyria and settled them in Haloh and in Habor (by the) river of Cozan and (in) the cities of the Medes.

(24) And the king of Assyria brought in (people) from Babylon, from Cuthah, from Ewa, from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim and settled (them) in the cities of Samaria in place of the children of Israel, so they possessed Samaria and lived in her cities.
(2) The Assyrian sources

a. Sargon’s Display Inscription published by R. Winckler

Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons I 100 f. II plate 50,
lines 23-25

(23) Sa-me-ri-na al-me ak-šud (24) 27,290 nišš(meš) a-šib libbi-šu
sā-lu-la 50 (isu) markabātī(meš) ina libbi-šu-ma aq-šur-ma û si-it-tu-ti
i-na-šu-ma ú-ša-hi-is (amēlū) tu-Šu-reši-ia eli-šu-ma aš-kun-ma biltu
harri māḫ-ri-1 (25) i-mid-šu-mu-ti

Translation

(23) Samaria I besieged I conquered. (24) 27,290 people dwelling
there I carried off. 50 chariots from them I gathered; and
others their (the departed inhabitants) portion I made them
take. My officer over them I set. The tribute of the former
king (25) I imposed on them.

b. Sargon’s Annals first year; published by Winckler

op. cit. II No. 63 Transcription & Translation

A. C. L. The Inscriptions of Sargon II King of
Assyria; Part I The Annals. Line 16 from the
restoration as given by A. T. Olmstead in "The Text
of Sargon’s Annals" A. J. S. E. 47 (1931) p. 262

(16) si-it-tu i-na-Šu-ma ú-ša-Ši-iz álū Šu-a-tu ú-tir-ma eli ša
pa-na u-se-me nišš(meš) māštē(meš) ki-sit-ti qâtē(Šu)-ia ina
lib-bi ú-še-šib

Translation

(16) The rest, their portion I made (them) take. That city I
restored and better than before I made it. People of the lands
my hands had conquered therein I settled.
Section 2. The Sources for the Revolt of Hamath, Damascus and Samaria

(1) Sargons Display Inscription (Winckler I 102-105 II
Pl. 31) lines 33-36, 25-26

(33) (1) (alu)Ia-á-di'-di (mátu)A-ma-ta-ái šubšu la dēl (isu)kussú
(amašu)pa-tu-ú lim-mu a-na šarru-ut (mátu)A-ma-at-ši libbi-šu
ik-pu-úd-ma (alu)Ar-pad-da (alu)Si-mir-ra (alu)Di-mas-qa
(alu)Sa-me-ri-na (34) it-ti-ia uš-bal-kit-ma pa-a i-da ʾša-šš-šiš-
šu-ra tāḫaši um-ma-na-st (alu)A-šur gab-ša-a-ti ad-ki-ma ina
(alu)Qar-o-ri álú na-ran-i-šu ša-a-šu a-di (amašu)mun-teš-si-šu
(36) al-me ak-dud (alu)Qar-o-ru ina iššāti aq-mu ša-a-šu ma-šak-šu
a-šu-šu ina qir-šu ša-šu šu-nu-ti bēl bi-it-ši a-šuk ma
su-lum-ma u ū-se-šš-šiš 200 (isu)narkaabátí 600 (amašu)biš-šallim
(36) i-na libbi nisēš (meš) (mátu)A-ma-at-ši aq-šur-ma eli ki-šir
šarru-ti-ia ú-rad-di (25) (I)ša-mu-mu šar (alu)ša-si-ti (I)šib'-ši
(amašu)tars-tam-mu (mátu)mu-šu-ri ina Ra-pi-ši a-na i-piš qabil u
ša-šu s-ešš-ti-ia it-bu-ni (26) Tašš-ešš-ma am-ša-ši (I)šib'-ši
ri-gim (isu)kakkāš (meš)-ši-a i-dur-ma in-na-bit-ma la in-na-mir
ša-šu (I)ša-mu-mu šar (alu)ša-si-ti ina qa-ti as-bat

Translation

(33) Ia'-ud'di of Hamath, a commoner with no right to the throne,
an evil Hittite, to be king of Hamath, in his heart he plotted.
Arpad, Simirra, Damascus, Samaria (34) against me he caused them
to revolt and united them, and prepared for battle. The massive
armies of Assyria I summoned to Qarqar his favorite city. Himself
with his fighters (35) I surrounded, I captured. Qarqar with
fire I burned. Him I flayed. In the midst of those cities the
rebels I killed and harmony I established. 200 chariots, 600 cavalry
(36) from among the people of Hamath I gathered and to my royal
corps I added them. (26) Hanno, king of Gaza, Sib'se, turtan of Egypt, at Rapihu to do battle and fight against me came out.

(26) I defeated them. Sib'se, at the clamor of my weapons became frightened and fled and was not seen any more. Hanno, king of Gaza, in (my) hand I seized.

(2) Nimrud Inscription; published by Winckler op. cit., I 169-170; II Pl. 48, line 9

(8) mu-niš-niš (mātu)Ia-ū-du ša a-šar-šu ru-ū-qu na-si-liš
(mātu)ša-am-ma-te ša (I)(1lu)Ia-ū-bi'-di ma-liššu-šu iq-šu-du qatša-šu

Translation

(8) subduer of Judah which is far away. Uprooter of Hamath, their king, Iaubi'di, his hands conquered.

Section 3. The Sources for the Revolt of Judah, Philistia, Edom, and Moab

(1) The Hebrew source, Isaiah 20:1

Translation

(1) In the year that Tartan came to Ashdod when Sargon, king of Assyria sent him, and he fought against Ashdod and captured it.

(2) The Assyrian sources

a. Sargon's Display Inscription (Winckler I 114-116 II Pl. 33-34) lines 90-112

(90) (I)A-su-ri šar (ālu)Aš-šu-di a-na la na-še-1 bi-li-ti (91) libbi-šu ik-pu-ud-ma a-na šarrānī(meš-ūti) li-me-ti-šu (92) zi-ra-a-ti
Translation

(90) Azuri, king of Ashdod not to deliver tribute  (91) his heart
plotted. To the kings of his neighborhood (92) hatred of Assyria he sent. Because of the evil he had done, (93) over the people of his land, his rule I abolished. (94) Ahimidi, his full brother, to be king over them I set up. (95) The Hittites, plotters of wickedness, his rule they hated, a Greek (96) ruler of the throne, (96) who like themselves fear of sovereignty did not know, they promoted over them. (97) With fury in my heart, the mass of my army (98) I did not assemble and did not prepare camp.

(99) With my warriors, who the place of friendship (100) at my side do not leave, to Ashdod (101) I went. That Greek, the coming of my expedition (102) far off he heard, and to the boundary of Egypt, which is on the border of Ethiopia, he fled, and was not seen any more (104) his place. Ashdod, Geby, Asudimma (105) I besieged. I conquered his gods, his wife, his sons, his daughters, (106) goods, property, treasures of his palace with the people of his land (107) for spoil I counted. Those cities (108) I seized anew. The people of the lands conquered by my hands (109) from (the region) of the East, therein I settled. And my official over them I set. With the people of Assyria I counted them and they pulled the straps (of my yoke). The king of Ethiopia (110) who in midst (lives) in an inapproachable region road — — who from distant days since the moon god, his father to my royal fathers (111) their messengers had not sent to bring their greetings. The might of Assur, Nabu and Marduk from afar he heard. The terrifying splendor of my kingship overpowered him and he was overwhelmed by fright. (112) Into fetters, shackles, iron bonds he threw him (the Greek). And to the midst of Assyria (a long) journey before me they brought him.
b. Sargon's broken prism A. (Winckler op. cit. I

186-189 II pl. 44) lines 36-33

(26) ša (mātu)Pī-liš-ti (mātu)Ia-ū-di (mātu)ū-du-[mu]

(27) (mātu)Na-a-bi a-ši-bu-ut tam-tim na-aš bil-[ti u]

(28) ta-mar-ti ša (ilu)Aššur be-li-ia (29) da-bab sa-ar-na-ā-te

la me-e-nu ḫul-la-ā-te (30) ša it-ti-ia a-na šum-ku-ri eli

(1)Pi-ir'-u (31) šar (mātu)ku-nṣ-ri mal-ku la mu-še-si-bi-šu-nu

(32) šul-man-na-šu-nu iš-šu-ū-ma e-tir-ri-šu-uš (33) ki-id-ra

Translation

(26) (the kings) of Philistia, of Judah, of Edom, (27) of Moab,
dwellers of the sea, bearers of (28) tribute, and revenue for
Aššur my Lord. (29) evil and malicious lies without number
(30) against me to make enmity rise (he spread) to Pīr'ū (31) king
of Egypt a ruler who could not save them (32) their bribes they
brought and they implored him (33) (to be their) ally.

Section 4. The Source for the Babylonian Embassy to Hezekiah

(1) Isaiah 39:1 & 2

(1) At that time Merodach-Baladān, son of Baladan, king of Babylon,

sent letters and a present to Hezekiah for he had heard that he
was sick and had recovered. (2) And Hezekiah was glad about them and showed them the house of his spices, the silver, the gold, the spices, the costly ointment, all his armory, and everything which was found in his treasuries. There was nothing in his house and in his entire dominion which Hezekiah did not show them.

Section 5. The Sources for the Invasion of Palestine by Sennacherib

(1) The Hebrew sources

a. 2 Kings 18:13-19:37
ליברליזם – סכנת התודעה, אֵילִי שֶּנֶּר – 6
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ברך рабך יתנינא.

עלתת מרו מרב מעיר מבית מבית.

אכזב קדם עד בית מבית מבית מבית.

אקובת כלים על ימם ימים ימים ימים ימים.

24. אבר ברע ישתית פה קרה.

היתב יבך יבך יבך יבך יבך.

למח למח כן כן כן כן כן.

26. ישוב יבך יבך יבך יבך יבך.

ידי דברים שיבחו לולא.

27. ישוב יבך יבך יבך יבך יבך.

28. על בטיחת על בטיחת.

לשב יפי יפי יפי יפי יפי.

קרוב יפי יפי יפי יפי יפי.

29. יקצר את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

שוב יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

30. יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

31. יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

32. יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

33. יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

34. יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

35. יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

36. יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.

37. יקצץ את הכסף ויקצץ את הכסף.
בְּאֶרֶץ בָּבֶל יָכְבָּר הַמַּעֲשֶׂה צָהָלָה וְצִבְיַחְוּ בְּפֶךְ מַמָּחֵר בָּלָה אַקְרֵבָּה לְעָבֹדֵיהֶם וְזָכַר בָּלוֹעָתָם. לְחַזֶּק אִשָּׁה בִּלְיָדָה וְלֹא תִשָּׁן אָכָל אֶלֹהִים. וְפָלָחֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר קָשָׁי אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר חָיָה בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים, וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים, וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים. וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים, וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים. וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים, וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים. וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים, וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים. וְקָרָאָה אֶלֹהִים בְּשֵׁמָה הַמַּעֲשֶׂה צָהָלָה וְצִבְיַחְוּ בְּפֶךְ מַמָּחֵר בָּלָה אַקְרֵבָּה לְעָבֹדֵיהֶם וְזָכַר בָּלוֹעָתָם.
translate the following text into English:

(13) In the fourteenth year of king Hesekiah Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came up against all the fortified cities of Judah and took them. (14) Then Hesekiah, king of Judah, sent (a message) to the king of Assyria at Lachish which said, I have done wrong, leave me alone and I will bear whatever you put on me. The king of Assyria charged Hesekiah, king of Judah, three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold. (15) And Hesekiah gave (him) all the silver that was found in the temple, and in the palace treasuries. (16) At that time Hesekiah cut off the gold from the doors of the temple of Yahweh and the pillars which Hesekiah, king of Judah had overlaid, and gave them to the king of Assyria. (17) And the king of Assyria sent Tartan, Rabsaris, and Rab-shakeh from Lachish to king Hesekiah with a heavy force (against) Jerusalem; and when they had gone up they came and stood in the channel of the upper pool which (was) by the highway of the fuller's field. (18) And they called to the king. There came out to them Eliakim, son of Hilkiah, who was the steward, and Shebna the scribe, and Joah son of Asaph, the recorder.
(19) And Rab-shakeh said to them, "Say, I pray to Hezekiah, thus says the great king, the king of Assyria, what is this confidence in which you trust? (20) You speak only foolish words. Counsel and strength for war. Now upon whom do you trust that you rebel against me? (21) Now, look, you trust yourself upon the support of this crushed reed, upon Egypt, which, if a man lean upon it, will go into his hand and pierce it; thus is Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to all who put their trust in him. (22) And if you say to me we trust in Yahweh, our God, is it not his high places and his altars which Hezekiah has removed? And he has said to Judah and to Jerusalem you shall worship before this altar in Jerusalem. (23) And now I pray, enter into combat with my master, the king of Assyria, and I will present to you a thousand horses if you are able to put riders on them. (24) And how shall you turn back the face of one governor of the least of the servants of my master? And you trust in Egypt for chariots and horsemen. (25) Now, have I without Yahweh come up against this place to destroy it? Yahweh said to me, "go up against this land and destroy it." (26) And Eliakim, son of Hilkiah, and Shebna, and Joah said to Rab-shakeh, "speak I pray to your servants in Aramaic for we understand it, and do not speak to us in Judean; in the ears of the people who are upon the wall." (27) But Rab-shakeh said to them, "Did my master send me to your master and to you to speak these words, and not to the men sitting on the wall to eat their dung and to drink their urine with you?" (28) And Rab-shakeh stood and cried in a loud voice in Judean and spoke, and said, "Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria. (29) Thus says the king, do not let Hezekiah deceive you for he
is not able to deliver you out of his hand. (30) And do not let Hezekiah entrust you to Yahweh saying, Yahweh will surely deliver us, and will not give this city into the hand of the king of Assyria. (31) Do not listen to Hezekiah because thus says the king of Assyria, make with me a blessing and come forth to me, and each man eat of his own vine, and each his own fig tree and drink each one water of his own well. (32) Until I come to take you to a land like your own land, a land of corn and new wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil and honey. Live and you shall not die, and do not listen to Hezekiah for he will incite you to say Yahweh will deliver us. (33) Have any of the gods of any of the nations ever delivered its land from the hand of the king of Assyria? (34) Where are the gods of Hamath, and Arpad? Where are the gods of Sephyrannim, Reha and Iva, that they should have delivered Samaria from my hand? (35) Who, among all the gods of the nations, has delivered their land from my hand, so that Yahweh should deliver Jerusalem out of my hand?" (36) And the people kept still and did not answer him a word, for the commandment of the king said "do not answer him." (37) Then Eliakim, son of Hilkiah, the steward, and Shebna the scribe, and Joah, son of Asaph, the recorder, went to Hezekiah (with) (their) garments rent, and they told to him the words of Rab-shakeh.

Chapter 19

(1) And when king Hezekiah heard he rent his garments, and clothed himself in sackcloth, and he went to the house of Yahweh (2) and sent Eliakim the steward, and Shebna the scribe and the elders of the priests, clothed in sackcloth, unto Isaiah the prophet,
the son of Amoz. (3) And they said to him, "Thus says Hezekiah, a day of distress, rebuke and reproach. This is the day that the children come to the mouth of the womb and there is no strength to bring to birth. (4) Perhaps Yahweh your God has heard all the words of Rab-shakeh whom the king of Assyria, his master, sent to despise the living God and to upbraid with words which Yahweh your God has heard. Now lift up intercession for the survivors which are left." (5) The servants of king Hezekiah came to Isaiah. (6) And Isaiah said to them, "Thus shall you say to your master, thus says Yahweh, do not be afraid on account the words with which you heard the servant of the king of Assyria revile me. (7) Lo, I will put a blast on him, he shall hear a report, and shall return to his own land and shall be felled by the sword in his own land." (8) And Rab-shakeh returned and found the king of Assyria fighting against Libnah for he had heard that he had removed camp from Lachish. (9) For he gave heed to Tirhakah, king of Ethiopia, who, it was said, had come forth to fight with him. So he again sent messengers to Hezekiah saying (10) Thus shall you speak to Hezekiah king of Judah saying, "Do not deceive yourself, your God in whom you trust saying he will not give Jerusalem into the hand of the king of Assyria. (11) Look you, take heed what the kings of Assyria did to all the nations, utterly destroying them, and shall you be delivered? (12) Have the gods of the nations which my fathers destroyed delivered them, Gozan, Haran, Rezeph, and the sons of Eden who were in Telassar? (13) Where is the king of Hamath, the king of Arpad, and the kings of the city of Sepharviam, Hena, and Ivah?" (14) And Hezekiah took the letters from the hand of the messengers
and read them, and went up to the house of Yahweh and he spread it out before Yahweh. (15) Then Hezekiah prayed before Yahweh and said, "Oh Yahweh, God of Israel, who sits upon the cherubs, thou who art God alone of all the kingdoms of the earth, thou hast made the heavens and the earth. (16) Oh Yahweh, incline thine ear and listen, Oh Yahweh, open thine eyes and see, and hear the words of Sennacherib which he sent to revile the living God. (17) It is true, Oh Yahweh, the kings of Assyria have destroyed the nations and their land (18) and have put their gods in the fire because they were not gods, but only the work of man's hand, of wood, and stones, and they destroyed them. (19) And now Yahweh our God, save us, I pray from his hand that all the kingdom of the earth may know, Oh Yahweh, that thou art God alone." (20) Then Isaiah, son of Amoz sent to Hezekiah saying "thus says Yahweh, God of Israel, to whom you prayed about Sennacherib, king of Assyria, I have heard. (21) This is the word Yahweh speaks concerning him, the virgin daughter of Zion has despised you, has mocked you, the daughter of Jerusalem has shaken her head at you. (22) Whom have you reviled and reproached? Against whom have you lifted up (your) voice and raised upon high your eyes? Against the Holy One of Israel. (23) By the hand of your messengers you reviled the Lord and you said by the multitude of my chariots I have gone up from the height of the mountains, the inner recesses of Lebanon. I have cut down the heights of its cedars, its choice cypress trees and I have entered into lodging places of the forest of his fruitful field. (24) I have dug and I have drunk of strange waters and I have dried up with soles of my feet all the rivers of fortified places. (25) Have you
not heard a long while ago that I did it, in ancient times and
I formed it, now I have caused that you should lay waste fortified
cities (in) desolate heaps? (26) Therefore, their inhabitants
were feeble, they were confounded and ashamed, they were as the
grass of the field and as green sprouts, as grass on the house
tops, blasted before it is grown up. (27) And I know your dwelling,
your going forth, your coming in, and your raging against me.
(28) Now your fury at me and your arrogance has come up into my
ears and I shall put my ring in your nose and my bridle in your
lips and I shall turn you back into the way in which you came.
(29) And this shall be a sign for you, you shall eat this year
that which grows up spontaneously, and in the second year also
that which grows up spontaneously, but in the third year sow and
harvest, and plant vineyards and eat their fruit. (30) And the
escaped of the house of Judah who are left shall again take root
downward and shall bear fruit upward. (31) For the survivors
shall go forth from Jerusalem, and the escaped from Mount Zion;
the seal of Yahweh shall perform this. (32) Therefore, thus says
Yahweh to the king of Assyria, he shall not come to this city,
nor shoot an arrow there nor shall a shield come against it, nor
shall he cast up a mound against it. (33) In the way in which
he came shall he return and he shall not enter this city, says
Yahweh. (34) I will protect this city to deliver it for my sake
and for the sake of David my servant." (35) And that night an
angel of Yahweh went out and smote 185,000 (men) in the camp of
Assyria, when they arose early in the morning, 10, all of them
were dead carcasses. (36) Then Sennacherib, king of Assyria
departed, went, and returned, and settled down in Niniveh.
(37) While he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch, his god, Adrammelek and Shareasar his sons smote him with the sword, and they escaped to the land of Ararat. And Esarhaddon, his son reigned in his stead.

b. 2 Chronicles 32: 1-21

(1) After these things of peace, Sennacherib, king of Assyria came; he advanced into Judah and besieged the fortified cities and he thought to take them by storm. (2) When Hezekiah saw that Sennacherib had come and that he intended to fight against Jerusalem, (3) he consulted with his princes and his commanders to stop up the waters of the fountains which were outside the city, and they helped him. (4) And many people were gathered together and they stopped up the fountains, and the stream which gushed out in the midst of the land, for they said, "Why should the kings of Assyria come and find (so) much water." (5) He also made himself strong and built up all the wall which was broken down and raised it up to the watchtowers, and another outside wall, and he strengthened Millo of the city of David, and he made weapons and shields in abundance. (6) And he set captains of war over the people, and he gathered them to him in the open place of the city gate and he spoke pleasantly to them saying: (7) "Be strong, and alert, do not be afraid nor panic stricken because of the king of Assyria and from the presence of all the crowd that is with him because there are more with us than with him. (8) With him (is) human power but with us (is) Yahweh, our God to help us and to fight our wars," and the people rested upon the words of Hezekiah king of Judah. (9) After this Sennacherib, king of Assyria sent his servants to Jerusalem (but he himself
was at Lachish and all his princes were with him) to Hezekiah
king of Judah and to all of Judah which was in Jerusalem and they
said (10) "Thus says Sennacherib king of Assyria, upon what are
you depending, who live in distress in Jerusalem? (11) Isn't
Hezekiah inciting you to give yourselves to die of hunger and of
thirst when he says Yahweh our God will deliver us from the king
of Assyria? (12) Isn't he the (same) Hezekiah who took away his
high places and his altars, and said to Judah and to Jerusalem,
before one altar you shall worship and upon it shall burn incense?
(13) Don't you know what I have done, I and my fathers, to the
people of (other) countries? Were the gods of the nations of
(these) lands able at all to deliver their country from me? (14) Who
(is there) among all the gods of these nations which my fathers
wiped out who was able to save its people from my clutches that
your God should be able to save you from my grasp? (15) How don't
let Hezekiah deceive you or urge you like this, don't believe him,
for no god of any nation or kingdom has been able to save its
people from my hand or the hand of my fathers. How much less
shall your God deliver you out of my hand." (16) Yet more did
his servants speak against Yahweh, the God, and against Hezekiah
his servant. (17) And he wrote letters reviling Yahweh, the God
of Israel and speaking against him saying "Just as the gods of
the nations of (other) lands were not able to save their people
from me, so the God of Hezekiah shall not deliver his people out
of my hand." (18) Then he cried in a loud voice in Judæan to the
people of Jerusalem who were on the wall to terrify them, and
to reduce them to despair so that they might capture the city.
(19) And they spoke against the God of Jerusalem (in the same way)
as (they spoke) against the gods of the people of (other) lands, 
which were made by human hands. (20) But Hezekiah, the king, 
and Isaiah, son of Amoz, the prophet, prayed about this and 
cried out (to) heaven. (21) And Yahweh sent an angel and he 
destroyed every mighty warrior, and leader, and commander in the 
camp of the king of Assyria; so he returned in disgrace to his 
own land. And when he came into the house of his god those who 
came forth from his loins felled him with a sword.

(2) The Assyrian sources

a. The Oriental Prism of Sennacherib, the final edition 
of the Annals of Sennacherib. Published by D. D. 
Inckenbill The Annals of Sennacherib  Transcription 
and translation pp. 29-34; text pp. 168-173

Col. II 87 - III 49

(37) i-na šal-ši gir-ri-ia a-na (mātu)įat-ti-lu al-lik (38) (I)Lu-li-i 
šar (ālu)si-du-un-ni pul-ši me-lam-ši (39) be-lu-ti-ia ie-ṣu-pu-šu-me 
a-na ru-uq-ki (40) qa-bal tam-tim in-na-bit-ša šad-da-šu e-mid
(41) (ālu)si-du-un-nu rabu(ū) (ālu)si-du-un-nu šiḫru (42) (ālu)Eš-ti-it-ti 
(ālu)za-ri-in-šu (ālu)Ma-bal-li-ba (43) (ālu)u-ṣū-ū (ālu)Ak-zi-ti 
(ālu)Ak-li-ū (44) ālāni(meš) šu dan-nu-ti Eš-turēni(meš) a-šar 
ri-i-ti (45) ā mar-qo-ti āt tuk-la-te-šu ra-šu-bat (ṣu)kaški
(ālu)āšur (46) bēl-li-ia ie-ṣu-pu-šu-numa ik-nu-šu še-pu-u-a
(47) (I)tu-ba-ši-lum i-na (ṣu)kussē šarru-ši (48) (ši)šu-un 
ū-še-ēb-ša Eš-ta-taš ša-ba-tu be-lu-ti-ia (49) šat-ti-ša na ba-ša-lu 
ū-kiš-ri-ū šu (50) Šā (I)Mi-in-hi-un-nu (ālu)šam-šu-ru-na-a
(51) (I)tu-ba-ši-lum (ālu)si-du-un-na-ši (52) (I)Ab-zi-li-ši-ti 
(ālu)A-ru-da-aš (53) (I)u-ru-mil-ki (ālu)šu-ub-la-aš (54) (I)Mi-ši-in-ti 
(56) (I)Kam-mu-su-na-ad-bi (mātu)Ma-1-da-ai (57) (I)Malik ram-mu
(mātu)ū-du-um-ma-as (58) šarrāni(meš) (mātu)Amurri(ki) ka-li-šu-un
igisi-e ḫad-lu-ti (59) ta-mar-ta-šu-nu ka-bit-tu a-di ribe-šu
a-na maḫ-ri-ia (60) iš-šu-nim-ma iš-ši-qu šēpā(du)-ia ū (I)ji-id-qa-a
(61) šār (ālu)Is-qa-al-lu-na ū la ik-nu-šu (62) a-na ni-ri-ia
ilāni(meš) bit abi-šu ša-a-šu aḏāt-su (63) mārā(meš)-šu marēti(meš)-šu
aḫē(meš)-šu zer bit abi-šu (64) as-su-ha-ma a-na (mātu)Aššur(ki)
ū-ra-šē-šu (65) (I)šarru-lu-da-ri már (I)Ru-kib-ti šarru-šu-nu
maḫ-ru-ū (66) eli nišē(meš) (ālu)Is-qa-al-lu-na aš-kum-ma (67) na-dan
bīlā cat-ri-e be-šu-ti-ia e-mid-su-ma (68) i-ša-a-at ap-ša-a-ni
i-na me-ti-šuq gir-ri-ia (69) (ālu)Bit-Da-gam-na (ālu)Ia-šu-pu-ū
(70) (ālu)Ba-na-zi-bar-qa (šēl)A-su-ru ilāni(meš) (71) ū (I)ji-id-qa-a
ēa a-na šēpā(du)-ia ar-šis (72) la ik-nu-šu al-me aḫšû(ud) aš-lu-la
šal-lu-šu-un (73) (amēlu)sakkanākē(meš) (amēlu)rubūti(meš) ū
nišē(meš) (ēlu)Am-qar-ru-na (74) ūa (I)Pa-di-i šarru-šu-nu bēl
di-e ū ma-met (75) ūa (mātu)Aššur(ki) bi-ri-tu parziali id-šu-ma
(76) a-na (I)Ḫa-zi-a-ū (mātu)la-ū-da-ai (77) id-ši-nu-šu
nak-riš a-na an-zil-li i-sir-šu (78) ip-šaḫ lib-ša-šu-un šarrāni(meš)
(mātu)Nu-su-ri (79) (amēlu)sabē(meš) (isu)qasti (isu)narkabāti(meš)
sisē(meš) (80) ūa šār (mātu)Me-luḫ-ḫi e-mu-qi la ni-bi
(61) ik-te-ru-nim-ma il-li-ku ri-su-su-un (82) i-na ta-mir-ti
(ālu)Al-ta-qu-ū (83) el-la-mu-nu si-id-ru šit-ku-nu

Col. III

(1) ū-ša-š-ū (isu)kakkē(meš)-šu-un i-na tuktulti(ti) (īlu)Aššur
(2) bēl-ia it-ti-šu-un am-da-ḫi-ša ma aḫ-ša-kan (3) tehta-šu-un
(amēlu)bēl (isu)narkabāti(meš) ū mārē(meš) šarrā(meš)
(4) (mātu)Nu-ru-ra-ai a-di (amēlu)bēl (isu)narkabāti(meš) ūa
šār (mātu)Me-luḫ-ḫi (5) bal-šu-šu-un i-na qabul taḫ-ša-ri ik-šu-da
(6) qâtâ(du)-ia (âlu)al-ta-qu-ú (âlu)Tam-na-a (7) al-me kâsâd(ud) 
a-lu-la šal-la-šu-un a-na (âlu)Am-qar-ru-na (8) aq-rib-ma 
(amâlu)šakkânašâ(meâ) (amâlu)râbââ(meâ) šâ hi-t-tú (9) ú-šâb-šu-ú 
a-duk-ma i-na di-ma-ti (10) si-ḫi-r-ti âli a-lul pag-ri-šu-un 
mârê(meâ) âli (11) e-piâ am-ni ù-qil-la-ti a-na šal-la-ti am-nu 
(12) si-it-tu-te-šu-nu la ba-bil hi-ti-ti (13) ù-qul-lul-ti 
šâ a-ra-an-šu-nu la ib-šu-ú (14) wâ-ḫur-šu-un aq-bî (1)Pa-di-
šarr-šu-nu (15) ul-tu qi-rib (âlu)Ur-sa-li-im-mu ù-še-ša-am-ma 
(16) i-na (isû)kussâ be-lu-ti aši-šu-un ù-še-šib-ma (17) man-da-at-tu 
be-lu-ti-ia ú-kin ši-ru-šê-šu (18) ù (1)ga-za-qi-a-ú (mâtu)fa-ú-da-ai 
(19) šâ la ik-nu-šu a-na ni-ři-ia 46 alâmï(meâ)-šu dan-nû-ti 
(20) bit-ôûrâmi(meâ) ù ilâmï(meâ) šihrûti(meâ) šâ li-me-ti-šu-nu 
(21) ša ni-ba la i-šu-ú i-na šuk-bu-us a-ram-me (22) ù qit-ru-ub 
šû-pi-i mit-šu-un su-uk šêpâ(du) (23) pil-ši nik-si ù kal-ban-na-te 
al-me akûd(ud) (24) 200,150 nišê(meâ) šihr rabû sikar ù zinništ 
(25) sisê(meâ) parâ(meâ) imêrê(meâ) gamalâ(meâ) (26) alpê(meâ) 
ù qi-s-ni šâ la ni-di ul-tu qir-bi-šu-un (27) ù-ša-ša-am-ma 
šal-la-tiš am-nu šâ-a-Šu kîma îṣṣur ku-up-pî (28) qi-rib 
(âlu)Ur-sa-li-im-mu âl šarru-ti-šu (29) e-sir-šu (âlu)šal-šu(meâ) 
eli-šu ū-rak-kis-ma (30) a-qi-e abul âli-šu ū-tir-ra ik-ki-tu-šû 
alâmî-šu (31) ša aš-lu-la ul-tu qi-rib mâtî-šu ab-tuq-ma 
(32) a-na (1)mi-ti-in-ti šar (âlu)Aš-du-đi (33) (1)Pa-di-ś 
šar (âlu)Am-qar-ru-na ù (1)šilli-bel (34) šar (âlu)ga-zi-ti 
ad-din-ma ù-ša-ab-ḫîr mât-sù (35) e-li bîti maḫš-ri-ti na-dan 
mâtî(ši)-šu-un (36) man-da-at-tu kaṭ-ri-e be-lu-ti-ia ù-rad-di-ma 
(37) ù-kin ši-ru-uo-šû ūn-ú (1)ga-za-qi-a-ú (38) pul-ḫi me-lam-me 
be-lu-ti-ia is-šu-pu-šu-ma (39) (amâlu)ur-bi-ù (amâlu)šâbâ(meâ)-šu 
damquši(meâ) ša a-na-dun-nun (40) (âlu)Ur-sa-li-im-mu âl šarru-ti-šu
ú-še-ri-bu-ṣa (41) ir-šu-ú bat-la-a-ti it-ti 30 bilat ṣuraṣa (42) 800 bilat kasa ni-siq-ti gu-uh-li (43) dag-gas-ṣi (ṣumu)ṣandā rabūtā(semi) (iṣu)irē(dei) ʿinni (44) (iṣu)kussi(ṣe) ni-me-dī ʿinni masak piri šin piri (45) (iṣu)uṣu (iṣu)urkarinnu munna šum-šu ni-ṣir-tu ka-bit-tu (46) ʿū mārātī(ṣe) ʿu šīgrēti(ṣe)-ṣu (amēlu)zamerē(ṣe) (47) (ṣal)zamerētē(ṣe) a-na qi-rib Nimna(ṣi) āl be-lu-ti-ia (48) arki-ia ú-še-bi-lam-ma a-na na-dan man-da-at-te (49) ú e-pīq ardū-ú-ti iš-pu-ra raq-ṇu-

Translation

(37) In my third campaign I went against Ṣatti (Syria) (38) Luli, king of Sidon, the fearful splendor (39) of my rulership overthrew him and far off (40) in the midst of the sea he fled and died there. (41) Great Sidon, little Sidon, (42) Bit-zitti, Zaribtu, Mahalliba (43) Ushu, Aksib, Akko (44) his strong walled cities where food and drink (were) (45) for his garrisons, the terror of the weapons of Ashur (46) my lord overwhelmed them and they bowed in submission to my feet. (47) Ethba'el on the royal throne (48) I seated over them and tribute, offering for my majesty (49) annually, without ceasing, I imposed upon him. (50) from Menahem from Shamsimuruna (51) Tuba'lu from Sidon (52) Ahdili'ti from Arvad (53) Urumilki from Byblos (54) Mitinti from Ashdod (55) Buduill from Beth-Asamon (56) Kammusunadbi from Moab (57) Malik-rammu from Edom (58) kings of Amuru all of them rich gifts (59) their heavy tribute fourfold before me (60) they brought and kissed my feet. Sidqa (61) king of Askkelon who did not submit (62) to my yoke, the gods of his father's house, himself, his wife (63) his sons, his daughters, his brothers, the seed of his father's house (64) I uprooted and to Assyria
I deported him. (65) Sharruludari, son of Rukibtu their former king (66) over the people of Askelon (67) I set and, payment of tribute, gifts to my majesty, I imposed on him; (68) he bore my yoke. In the course of my campaign (69) Beth Dagon, Joppa (71) (70) Benai-Barqa, Asura, cities of Sidqa, who to my feet speedily (72) did not bow in submission. I besieged, I conquered, I carried away their spoil. (73) The officials, nobles and people of Ekron (74) who Padi, their king, lord of oath and curse (75) of Assyria, in fetters of iron they threw (76) to Hesekiah the Judean. (77) He put him (as) an enemy wantonly into prison. (78) Their heart feared the kings of Egypt. (79) Soldiers, bowmen, chariots and horses (80) of the king of Ethiopia, an army beyond counting (81) they made alliance with, they came to their aid (82) in the plain of Eltekeh (83) before me their battle lines were drawn.

Col. III

(1) They offered battle. With the help of Ashur (2) my lord, with them I fought and brought about (3) their defeat. The charioteers and princes (4) of Egypt with the charioteers of the king of Ethiopia (5) alive, in the midst of battle, my hands (6) captured. Eltekeh and Tinnah (7) I besieged, conquered and took away their spoil. To Ekron (8) I drew near. The officials and nobles, who committed sin. (9) I killed (them); on stakes (10) around the city I hung their bodies. (11) The citizens (who) committed sin and frivolity for spoil I counted. (12) The rest of them, not carriers of sin (13) and contempt, for whom there was no (punishment), (14) their pardon I spoke. Padi their king (15) from Jerusalem I caused to be brought.
(16) On the royal throne over them I set (him). (17) and my royal tribute I imposed on him. (18) As for Hesekiah the Judean (19) who did not submit to my yoke, 46 of his strong, walled (20) cities and small cities, which were in their vicinity, (21) which were without number, by treading down a ramp, (22) and bringing up battering rams, attacking by infantry shock troops, (23) mines, tunnels and breaches I besieged, I conquered. (24) 200,150 people small and great, male and female; (25) horses, mules, asses, camels, (26) cattle and sheep without number from them (27) I brought away and counted for spoil. Himself like a bird in a cage, (28) in Jerusalem, his royal city, (29) I shut up, with earthworks I surrounded him, and (30) one going out of the gate of his city I turned back to his misery. The cities of his (31) which I despoiled, as from his land, I cut off. (32) To Nititi king of Ashdod, (33) Padi king of Ekron and Silli-bel (34) king of Gaza I gave. I diminished his land. (35) To the former tribute the giving (up) of their land (36) offering of presents for my majesty I added, (37) I imposed upon him. As for Hesekiah (38) terrifying splendor of my majesty (39) overcame him. His precious Arab troops, which to strengthen (40) Jerusalem, the royal city, he brought in, (41) they took leave. In addition to 30 talents of gold, (42) 800 talents of silver, precious jewels, (43) gems, large sandstones, beds of ivory, (44) ivory easy chairs, elephant hide, elephant ivory, (45) ebony, boxwood, all kinds of valuable treasures; (46) his daughters, his harem, male and female (47) musicians to Nineveh, my royal city, (48) after me, he brought them. To pay tribute (49) and do servitude he sent his messenger.
b. Rassam Cylinder Sennacherib (80, 7-19, 1). (Extract)
Published by T. A. Eveets in Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
Vol. III (1888) p. 311 ff. Transcription and translation
by D. D. Luckenbill op. cit. p. 60 ff. lines 56-60

(56) 30 bilda ḫuruṣa 800 bilda kaspa ni-siq-ti gu-úḫ-ši dag-gas-si
(abmu)andsa(meš) rabatš(meš) (išu)irsē šinni (išu)kuesš(meš)
ni-me-di šinni mašak pffi šin ppiš (išu)ušu (išu)urkarimmu lu-bul-ti
bir-me (ṣubat)kitu šipatu ta-kil-tu šipatu ar-ga-man-nu (57) ū-mu-ut
siparri parsalli eri anči parsalli (išu)nakarbate(meš) ga-ba-bi
as-ma-ri-e si-ri-ia-am paṭrē(meš) parsalli šib-bi-pit-pa-ni u
uṣ-ṣi til-li ū-mu-ut ta-ḥa-zi sa ni-ba la i-šu-ū (58) it-ti maratā(meš)-šu
zinniat(meš) šakall-šu (anēmu)sumerē(meš) (šal)sumerate(meš) i-na
qi-rib (ṣlu)Nima él be-lu-ti-ia arki-ia ú-še-bi-lem-ma an-na an-dan
man-da-at-ti ú s-piš ardu-ū-di (59) i-na sal-la-at matāti(meš)
ša-ti-na ša as-lu-la 10,000 (išu)qašti 10,000 (išu)a-ri-tu ina
lib-bi-šu-nu aq-pur-ma eli ki-ir šarru-ti-ia ú-ra-đ-di (60) si-it-ti
šal-la-ti na-kir ka-bit-tu an-na gi-mir karāši-ia u (anēmu)bēl
pihāti-ia nišš(meš) ma-ḫa-saz-ni-ia rabatš(meš) ki-ma ši-e-ni lu ū-sa-i-is

Translation

(56) 30 talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, gems, antimony,
jewels, great sandu stones, ivory beds, standing chairs of ivory,
elephant hides, elephant tusks, ebony, boxwood, colored garments,
garments of linen, violet and purple wool, (57) vessels of
copper, iron, bronze, lead, iron, chariots, shields, lances,
armor, iron girdle-daggers, bows and arrows, spears, implements
of war beyond counting; (58) with his daughters, his palace
women, his male and female musicians to Nineveh, city of my
royalty, after me he caused to be brought. Paying tribute and
doing servitude he sent his messenger. (59) From the spoil of those lands which I plundered, 10,000 bows, 10,000 shields from them I took and to my royal equipment I added. (60) The rest of the heavy booty of the enemy to my entire camp and (to) my governors (and) people of my large cities, like sheep, I divided.

(c) Epigraph from a relief, "Sennacherib at Lachish."

Text Rev. Archibald Patterson Assyrian Sculptures: The Palace of Sennacherib Pl. 74-76 Transliteration and translation Luckenbill op. cit. p. 156

(1) (tu)Sin-aqē(mē)-eriba šar kiḫatti šar (matu) (tu)Aššur
(2) ina (qum)kussi ni-me-di ū-šib-ma (3) šal-la-at (alu)La-ki-šu
(4) ma-ḫa-ar-šu e-ti-iq

Translation

(1) Sennacherib, king of the universe, king of Assyria. (2) on a reclining chair he sat and (3) the booty of Lachish (4) before him passed.

Section 6. The Sources for the Payment of Tribute by Manasseh to Assyria

(1) Prism of Esarhaddon Published by R. Campbell Thompson

The Prisms of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal p. 25 f.

and plates 8 and 9 Prism B Col. V 54 – VI 1

The document contains a list of kings summoned across the river, followed by a translation. The text is in a mix of akkadian and hebrew. Here is the translation:

(54) I summoned the kings of Hittite land across the river (55) Ba'al, king of Tyre, Manasseh, king of Judeah, (56) Qashgabri, king of Edom, Masuri, king of Moab, (57) Sil-bel, king of Gaza, Netinti, king of Askelon, (58) Ikausu, king of Ekron, (59) Milkiashapa, king of Byblos (60) Matanba'al, king of Arvad, (61) Abiba'al, king of Samsinurruna, (62) Puduil, king of Beth Armon, Ahimalki, king of
Ashdod, (63) 12 kings of the shore of the sea. Ekishstura,
(64) king of Idalion Pilagura, king of Chytros (65) Kis, king
of Soli (66) Ituandar, king of Paphos (67) Erisu, king of Silli,
Damasu, king of Curium (68) Atmasu, king of Tamesi (69) Damusi,
king of Carthage (70) Unasagusu, king of Ledra (71) Bususu,
king of Muria, 10 kings from Cyprus (72) amidst the sea, all
together 22 kings of Hatti, the seacoast (73) and islands all
of them I sent. And (74) great beams, strong pillars, dressed (?)
boards (75) of cedar pine trees, product of Sirara and Lebanon,
(76) which from old grew strong and tall; (77) winged bulls, colossi
of limestone^ (78) female colossi, cow colossi, slabs of burnt
brick, (79) of marble,^ of limestone, large and small (80) breccia,^5
of yellow limestone,^6 of fruit-shaped pyrites, (81) from the
mountains, the place of their creation, (82) for need of my palace,
with difficulty and trouble.

Col. VI

(1) to Nineveh, city of my lordship, they carried.
(2) Cylinder C of Ashurbanipal Published by Samuel Alden
Smith Die Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipal II R 3 translitera-
tion p. 25-27, text plates V & VI. Transliteration and translation also in W. Streck Assurbanipal
und die letzten assyrischen Königen bis zum Untergang
Nineveh II p. 138 ff. lines 23-50

(23) ina me-ti-iq gir-ri-ia (24) (I)bả-u-šar (matu)sher-ri
(25) (I)mi-in-si-e šar (matu)la-ú-di (26) (I)ča-ša-gab-ri šar (matu)li-du-me
(27) (I)mu-sur-ri šar (matu)ma-ša (28) (I)šil-bel šar
(matu)ša-zi-ti (29) (I)mi-ti-in-ti šar (matu)ša-qa-lu-na
(30) (I)ša-ša-su šar (matu)am-qar-u-na (31) (I)šu-ša-ša-pa
Translation

In the course of my campaign

Manasseh, king of Judah.

Mursi, king of Moab.

Silbel, king of Gaza.

Mitinti, king of Ascalon.

Ikasu, king of Ekron.

Milki-ashpa, king of Byblos.

Jakindu, king of Arvad.

Abib'al, king of Samsimurun.

Alminadhi, king of Beth-Ammun.

Ahumilki, king of Ashdod.

Oktishtura, king of Idalion.

Pilgaru, king of Chytros.

Kesa, king of Soli.

Ituandar, king of Paphos.

Erisu, king of Silli.

Damasu, king of Curium.

Damesu, king of Tanezru.

Damasu, king of Carthage.

Unasagusu, king of Ledra.

Bususu, king of Hure.

all together 22 kings of the seacoast

in the midst of the sea and dryland,

servants, subjects of mine,

their heavy tribute

they brought before me and kissed my feet.
(3) Receipt for tribute from Palestine. Published by
R. F. Harper Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Part VI
Letter 632 Br. M. K-1295 Transliteration and Transla-
tion Leroy Waterman Royal Correspondence of the
Assyrian Empire Part I p. 440-441

(1) 2 ma-na ḫūrāṣī
(2) (mātu)Bit-As-man-na-a-a
(3) 1 ma-na ḫūrāṣī
(4) (mātu)Mi-'ab-a-a
(5) 10 ma-na kāspī
(6) (mātu)Ia-u-da-a-a
(7) ___ ma-na kāspī
(mātu)U-du-na a-a

(1) Two minas of gold
(2) from the people of Bit-Ammon.
(3) One mina of gold
(4) from the people of Moab.
(5) Ten minas of silver
(6) from the people of Judah
(7) ___ minas of silver
from the people of Edom

Section 7. The Source for the Carrying of Manasseh to Babylon,
and his Return

2 Chronicles 33: 11-13

11 אֶל ָבַּי לְהוֹרְתֶּה אֶשְּׁבָּר, הַעֲבָּרָתֵל לְךָ נְאָר יִכָּלָּר
12 מֶלֶךְ נְחַבֵּל בְּחָסֶרֶת, חוֹשֵׁבֵל לְךָ חַלָּר, בְּבָּשִּׁבֵל לְךָCHASE.

Translation

(11) Therefore Yahweh caused officers of the army of the king of
Assyria to come upon them and they captured Manasseh with hooks
and they bound him with fetters and took him to Babylon. (12) And
when he was in distress he implored the favor of Yahweh his God
and humbled himself very much before the God of his ancestors.
(13) So he prayed to him and he was intreated and heard his prayer and caused him to return to Jerusalem to his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that Yahweh was God.

Section 8. The Source for the Later Resettlement of Samaria  Ezra 4:2,9,10

Ezra 4:2

ש' 1. אישר אל-תרעמל אַיָּל-ךְּרָשַׁר הַצְּבָּא הַעֲקַר לָקֶם לֶא-שָׁלֵם

Translation

(2) And they approached Zerubbabel and the chiefs of the fathers and said to them “Let us build with you for we seek your God as you do, and we have been sacrificing to him since the days of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, who brought us up to this place.”

Ezra 4:9 & 10

כ' 6. אנא רצוי לתחם עבֵד-שלום. תאות אשא גֹּאָל- tatsוֹנִי ה'כו

Translation

(9) Then Nehum, the royal prefect, and Shimshai, the scribe, and the rest of their associates the Dinaites, the Arpharsadathites, the Tarpelites, the Apharsites, the Archevites, the Babylonians, the Shushanchites, the Dehavites, the Elamites. (10) and the rest of the people which the great and noble Assappar brought over and settled in the cities of Samaria, and the rest which are from the region beyond the Euphrates, thus.
APPENDIX II  COMPARISON OF THE CAPTIVITIES OF MANASSEH AND NECHO

We can easily visualize Manasseh's captivity and return in the light of what we read about Necho and his return. For indeed the historical situation of each is very similar. Each was the ruler of a province subject to Assyria and was found to be conspiring against that land.

Necho was taken to Nineveh, Manasseh to Babylon. This is the chief difference between the two events. But all that this indicates is that the two captivities happened at different times. Both may have occurred in the reign of the same king; i. e., Ashurbanipal, or Manasseh's captivity took place in the reign of another king; i. e., Esarhaddon.

We know Necho received the benefit of a conciliatory policy on the part of Ashurbanipal. Manasseh also received benefit of what must have been the same policy on the part of an Assyrian monarch. Otherwise, he would not have been sent back home. Being told that the great king did have such an attitude in the case of Necho, we wonder why he did. He tells us that he imposed on Necho a more severe oath than formerly, before he bestowed favors upon him. He must have considered that this was the best way to obtain the loyalty of a prince. We find that this policy paid off in the case of Necho. In subsequent relations with Egypt, Necho's son became a Pharaoh loyal to the empire, until Assyria ceased to be worthy of loyalty.

If such a policy was practical for Assyria in the case of Necho, it might very well be the same in the case of Manasseh. We may assume that the Judean king had a severe oath imposed on him; otherwise he would not have been returned to his throne. We can understand that the Assyrian king would consider that Manasseh, being so bound and afterwards favored by being restored to his throne, would be apt to remain loyal. And we know that the ruler of Judah did stay loyal to Assyria.

Thus from Necho's experience we can easily fill in the unknown gaps of Manasseh's experience.
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