

▲

**CYCLOPÆDIA**

OF

**BIBLICAL LITERATURE**

EDITED BY

**JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.,**

RECTOR OF 'THE PICTORIAL BIBLE,' AUTHOR OF 'THE HISTORY AND PHYSICAL  
GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE,' &c. &c.

ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS.

---

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

---

NEW YORK:  
MARK H. NEWMAN, 199 BROADWAY.  
CINCINNATI:  
WILLIAM H. MOORE & CO., 110 MAIN STREET.  
1848.

which sprung from him formed eventually an important section of the tribes of which it was composed. The celebrated prophecy which describes the habits of life which he, and in him his descendants, would follow, is, therefore, to be regarded not as describing habits which he would first establish, but such as he would adopt. The description is contained in the address of the angel to Hagar, when, before the birth of Ishmael, she fled from the tents of Abraham:—'Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael (*God hears*), because the Lord hath heard thine affliction. And he shall be a wild man: his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him, and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren' (Gen. xvi. 11, 12). This means, in short, that he and his descendants should lead the life of the Bedouins of the Arabian deserts; and how graphically this description portrays their habits, may be seen in the article *ARABIA*, in the notes on these verses in the 'Pictorial Bible,' and in the works of Niebuhr, Burckhardt, Lane, &c.; and, more particularly, in the Arabian romance of Antar, which presents the most perfect picture of real Bedouin manners now in existence. The last clause, 'He shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren,' is pointedly alluded to in the brief notice of his death, which states that 'he died in the presence of all his brethren' (Gen. xxv. 18). Of this expression various explanations have been given, but the plainest is the most probable: which is, that Ishmael and the tribes springing from him should always be located near the kindred tribes descended from Abraham. And thus was a promise of benefit in that age of migration, when Abraham himself had come from beyond the Euphrates, and was a stranger and sojourner in the land of Canaan. There was thus, in fact, a relation of some importance between this promise and the promise of the heritage of Canaan to another branch of Abraham's offspring. It had seemingly some such force as this—The heritage of Canaan is, indeed, destined for another son of Abraham; but still the lot of Ishmael, and of those that spring from him, shall never be cast far apart from that of his brethren. This view is confirmed by the circumstance, that the Israelites did, in fact, occupy the country bordering on that in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled—the Israelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, &c. Most interpreters find in this passage, a promise that the descendants of Ishmael should never be subdued. But we are unable to discover this in the text; and, moreover, such has not been the fact, whether we regard the Ishmaelites apart from the other Arabians, or consider the promise made to Ishmael as applicable to the whole Arabian family. The Arabian tribes are in a state of subjection at this moment; and the great Wahabee confederacy among them, which not many years ago filled Western Asia with alarm, is now no longer heard of.

2. ISHMAEL, a prince of the royal line of Judah, who found refuge among the Ammonites from the ruin which involved his family and nation. After the Chaldeans had departed he

returned, and treacherously slew the too-confiding Gedaliah, who had been made governor of the miserable remnant left in the land [*GEDALIAH*]. Much more slaughter followed this, and Ishmael, with many people of consideration as captives, hastened to return to the Ammonites. But he was overtaken near the pool of Gileon by Johanan, a friend of Gedaliah, and was compelled to abandon his prey and escape for his life, with only eight attendants, to Baalis, king of the Ammonites, with whom he appears to have had a secret understanding in these transactions: *s. c.* 585 (Jer. xli.).

ISLE, ISLAND (יִסְרָאֵל; Sept. *νησος*, Vulg. *insula*). The Hebrew word is invariably translated, either by the former or by the latter of these English words, which, having the same meaning, will be considered as one. It occurs in the three following senses. First, that of dry land in opposition to water; as 'I will make the rivers islands' (Isa. xlii. 15). In Isa. xx. 6, the Isle of Ashdod means the country, and is so rendered in the margin. In Isa. xxiii. 2, 6, 'the isle' means the country of Tyre, and in Ezek. xxvii. 6, 7, that of Chittim and Elisha. (See also Job xxii. 30). Secondly; it is used both in Hebrew and English, according to its geographical meaning, for a country surrounded by water, as in Jer. xlvi. 4, 'the isle (margin) of Caphtor,' which is probably that of Cyprus. 'The isles of the sea' (Ezek. x. 1) are evidently put in opposition to 'the land,' or continent. In Ps. xcvi. 1, 'the multitude of the isles' seem distinguished from the earth or continents, and are evidently added to complete the description of the whole world. Thirdly; the word is used by the Hebrews to designate all those countries divided from them by the sea. In Isa. xi. 11, after an enumeration of countries lying on their own continent, the words, 'and the islands of the sea,' are added in order to comprehend those situate beyond the ocean. The following are additional instances of this usage of the word, which is of very frequent occurrence (Isa. xlii. 10; lix. 18; lxvi. 19; Jer. xxv. 22; Ezek. xxvii. 3, 15; Zeph. ii. 11). It is observed by Sir I. Newton (*on Daniel*, p. 276), 'By the earth the Jews understood the great continent of all Asia and Africa, to which they had access by land; and by the isles of the sea they understood the places to which they sailed by sea, particularly all Europe.—J. F. D.

ISRAEL (יִשְׂרָאֵל; Sept. *Ἰσραήλ*) is the sacred and divinely bestowed name of the patriarch Jacob, and is explained to mean, 'A prince with God,' from *יָרַח*, *principatum tenuit*. Winer (*Heb. Lexicon*) interprets it *pugnator Dei*, from another meaning of the same root. Although, as applied to Jacob personally, it is an honourable or poetical appellation, it is the common prose name of his descendants; while, on the contrary, the title Jacob is given to them only in poetry. In the latter division of Isaiah (after the 39th chapter), many instances occur of the two names used side by side, to subserve the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, as in ch. xl. 27; xli. 8, 14, 20, 21; xlii. 24; xliii. 1, 22, 28, &c.; so, indeed, in xiv. 1. The modern Jews, at least in the East, are fond of being named *Israēli* in preference to *Yahūdi*, as more honourable.

The separation of the Hebrew nation into two parts, of which one was to embrace ten of the tribes, and be distinctively named Israel, had its origin in the early power and ambition of the tribe of Ephraim. The rivalry of Ephraim and Judah began almost from the first conquest of the land; nor is it insignificant, that as Caleb belonged to the tribe of Judah, so did Joshua to that of Ephraim. From the very beginning Judah learned to act by itself; but the central position of Ephraim, with its fruitful and ample soil, and the long-continued authority of Joshua, must have taught most of the tribes west of the Jordan to look up to Ephraim as their head; and a still more important superiority was conferred on the same tribe by the fixed dwelling of the ark at Shiloh for so many generations (Josh. xviii. &c.). Judah could boast of Hebron, Macpelah, Bethlehem, names of traditional sanctity; yet so could Ephraim point to Shechem, the ancient abode of Jacob; and while Judah, being on the frontier, was more exposed to the attack of the powerful Philistines, Ephraim had to fear only those Canaanites from within who were not subdued or conciliated. The haughty behaviour of the Ephraimites towards Gideon, a man of Manasseh (Judg. viii. 1), sufficiently indicates the pretensions they made. Still fiercer language towards Jephthah the Gileadite (Jud. xii. 1) was retorted by less gentleness than Gideon had shown; and a bloody civil war was the result, in which their pride met with a severe punishment. This may in part explain their quiet submission, not only to the priestly rule of Eli and his sons, who had their centre of authority at Shiloh, but to Samuel, whose administration issued from three towns of Benjamin. Of course his prophetic character and personal excellence eminently contributed to this result; and it may seem that Ephraim, as well as all Israel besides, became habituated to the predominance of Benjamin, so that no serious resistance was made to the supremacy of Saul. At his death a new schism took place through their jealousy of Judah; yet, in a few years' time, by the splendour of David's victories, and afterwards by Solomon's peaceful power, a permanent national union might seem to have been effected. But the laws of inheritance in Israel, excellent as they were for preventing permanent alienation of landed property, and the degradation of the Hebrew poor into prædial slaves, necessarily impeded the perfect fusion of the tribes, by discouraging intermarriage, and hindering the union of distant estates in the same hands. Hence, when the sway of Solomon began to be felt as a tyranny, the old jealousies of the tribes revived, and Jeroboam, an Ephraimite (1 Kings xi. 26), being suspected of treason, fled to Shishak, king of Egypt. The death of Solomon was followed by a defection of ten of the tribes, which established the separation of *Israel* from *Judah* (acc. 975).

This was the most important event which had befallen the Hebrew nation since their conquest of Canaan. The chief territory and population were now with Jeroboam, but the religious sanction, the legitimate descent, lay with the rival monarch. From the political danger of allowing the ten tribes to go up to the sanctuary of Jerusalem, the princes of *Israel*, as it were in self-defence, set up a sanctuary of their own; and the

intimacy of Jeroboam with the king of Egypt may have determined his preference for the form of idolatry (the calves) which he established at Dan and Bethel. In whatever else his successors differed, they one and all agreed in upholding this worship, which, once established, appeared essential to their national unity. Nevertheless it is generally understood to have been a worship of Jehovah, though under unlawful and degrading forms. Worse by far was the worship of Baal, which came in under one monarch only, Ahab, and was destroyed after his son was slain, by Jehu. A secondary result of the revolution was the ejection of the tribe of Levi from their lands and cities in Israel; at least, such as remained were spiritually degraded by the compliances required, and could no longer offer any resistance to the kingly power by aid of their sacred character. When the priestly tribe had thus lost independence, it lost also the power to assist the crown. The succession of Jeroboam's family was hallowed by no religious blessing; and when his son was murdered, no Jehoiaada was found to rally his supporters and ultimately avenge his cause. The example of successful usurpation was so often followed by the captains of the armies, that the kings in Israel present to us an irregular series of dynasties, with several short and tumultuous reigns. This was one cause of disorder and weakness to Israel, and hindered it from swallowing up Judah: another was found in the relations of Israel towards foreign powers, which will presently be dwelt upon.

We must first attend to the chronology; in discussing which Israel and Judah must be taken together. It lies on the face of the narrative that the years of reign assigned are generally only broken years: thus Nadab is said to have come to the throne in the second and to have been slain in the third year of Asa, and yet to have reigned *two* years (1 Kings xv. 25, 28); consequently every reign is liable to a deduction not exceeding eleven months. Instances will also appear in which reigns are *underrated* by a fraction of a year: it is doubtful whether this is another sort of phraseology, or is an error properly so called. Some have further maintained (as Mr. Greswell) that the reigns of kings were counted, at least occasionally, from the beginning of the Jewish year. To illustrate the effect of this: suppose a king of England to come to the throne in September, an event which happened in the following March might be assigned to the *second* year of his reign, though he would not have completed even a single year. The great objections to applying this principle are, 1. that we have no proof that it was actually used; 2. that it introduces great vagueness, since we do not once know at what *season* of the year any king began his reign; 3. that it solves none of the greater difficulties encountered, and that it is not worth while appealing to it for the smaller ones. Even if applied, the total effect of it on the chronology is almost inappreciable, for the limits of possible error remain perhaps exactly as without it. The once favourite system, of imagining a king to rule conjointly with his father, when it is not intimated in the Scripture, is now deservedly exploded by all the ablest chronologers.

The following table contains the materials for chronology furnished in the Scriptures:—

Accession of a king of Judah.	Years of Reign.	Year of preceding king of Israel.	Accession of a king of Israel.	Years of Reign.	Year of preceding king of Judah.
Rehoboam . . . . .	*17	—	Jeroboam . . . . .	22	—
Abijah . . . . .	3	18th	Nadab . . . . .	2	2nd
Asa . . . . .	41	20th	Baasha . . . . .	24	3rd
			Elah . . . . .	2	26th
			Zimri . . . . .	7 days	27th
			Omri . . . . .	12	*(31st)
			Ahab . . . . .	*22	38th
Jehoshaphat . . . . .	*25	4th	Ahaziah . . . . .	2	17th
			Jehoram . . . . .	12	18th
Jehoram . . . . .	8	5th			
Ahaziah . . . . .	1	12th	Jehu . . . . .	*28	—
[Queen Athaliah] . . . . .	7	—	Jehoahaz . . . . .	17	23rd
Jehoash . . . . .	40	7th	Jehoash . . . . .	16	*37th
			Jeroboam II. . . . .	†41	15th
Amaziah . . . . .	29	2nd	Zachariah . . . . .	½	38th
Uzziah . . . . .	*52	†27th	Shallum . . . . .	½	39th
			Menahem . . . . .	*10	39th
			Pekahiah . . . . .	2	50th
Jotham . . . . .	16	2nd	Pekah . . . . .	†20	52nd
Abaz . . . . .	16	17th			
Hesekiah . . . . .	29	*3rd	Hoshea . . . . .	9	12th
			Samaria taken . . . . .	—	6th

Some of these data are inconsistent with others, and it is important to decide which of them need correction. Of course (other things being equal), those changes are to be preferred which least disturb the system as a whole. But it is well to distinguish between the numbers marked with an asterisk (\*) and those to which an obelus (†) is added. The former are wrong only by a unit or two, and therefore perhaps can be resolved by interpretation: the latter are quite untenable. These must be separately remarked upon.

I.—1. Rehoboam is said to have reigned 17 years; yet Abijah succeeded him in the 18th year of Jeroboam. We must then explain 17 to mean 17 and a fraction, which is contrary to the usual Hebrew method. 2. Ahab seems to have reigned less than 21 years, since Jehoshaphat succeeded in his 4th year, and Ahaziah followed in Jehoshaphat's 17th year. It is better to alter 22 to 21 than 4th to 5th, or 17th to 18th; for if 4th were changed to 5th, Asa's reign would become (more than) 42, not 41 years: if 17th were made 18th, the accession of Jehoram in the 18th year must be further disturbed. 3. The length of Jehoshaphat's reign involves a difficulty at first sight: since Jehoram of Israel came to the throne in his 18th year, and in Jehoram's 5th the other Jehoram followed, Jehoshaphat appears to have reigned less than 18 + 5 years. It is true that his son was installed in power during his life (2 Kings xviii. 16); but in the opinion of Mr. Clinton and others the son's reign could not be reckoned from that event, but from the father's

death. If this be true, 25 must be altered to 26 or 22, as by far the simplest remedy. Nevertheless Mr. Clinton's opinion is here by no means self-evident. If Jehoram received not merely actual power, as Jotham did, who was regent for his father (2 Kings xv. 5), but a ceremonial installation, it is credible that his reign should have been dated from this event, although Jehoshaphat's reign would still be estimated from its commencement to his death. We may then neglect the 25 as insignificant to the chronology, regarding Jehoram in any case to have commenced his reign in the 22nd or 23rd of his father. [After these remarks a very simple process determines that from Jeroboam to Jehu includes more than 88 and less than 92 years. Thus—

	Years.	Mths.	Years.	Mths.
Jeroboam . . . . .	0	0	0	0
Abijah . . . . .	18	1	or 18	0
Asa . . . . .	20	2	20	11
Jehoshaphat . . . . .	60	3	61	10
Jehoram of Israel . . . . .	77	4	79	9
Jehu . . . . .	88	5	91	8

Hence no decisive result is attainable from the data.]

But further: 4. Jehu's reign exceeded 28 years, since Jehoash succeeded in his 7th year, and Jehoahaz in Jehoash's 23rd. We must interpret 28 to mean 28 and a fraction, as in Rehoboam's case. 5. Jehoash of Judah reigned less than 39 full years if his namesake of Israel began to reign in his 37th year, and in the 2nd year of

the latter Amaziah succeeded. The Sept. has 39 instead of 37 'in some copies,' says Mr. Clinton (the Vatican Sept. agrees with the received text, and so does Josephus); and though this is probably a mere correction, it seems to be right, since it is requisite to make good the 17 years of reign for Jehoahaz. 6. Uzziah reigned *more than* 52 full years, since Pekah came to the throne in his 52nd and Jotham in Pekah's 2nd year. Once more, then, 52 means 52 and a fraction. 7. Menabem, for a like reason, reigned not 10 years current, but 10 years and some months, since he succeeded in Uzziah's 39th, and Pekahiah followed in Uzziah's 60th. In all the cases where a whole number is thus used with the omission of a fraction, a cautious chronologer ought perhaps to add days less than a month, if that is enough to satisfy the other conditions. 8. Ahaz reigned not 16 years current, but less than 15 full years, if Hoshea succeeded in his 12th and Hezekiah in Hoshea's 3rd year; but which of the three numbers concerned is to be regarded as faulty is extremely doubtful. Winer and Clinton both make Hezekiah ascend the throne in the *fourth* year of Hoshea; but it would serve equally well to alter '12th of Ahaz' into 13th or 14th.

II.—Some greater deviations must now be noticed. 1. The accession of Omri is placed in the 31st year of Am; but this must clearly be reckoned from his residence in *Samaría* (1 Kings xvi. 23). Even this is inconsistent with the statement that he reigned 'six years in Tirzah;' for in the 31st of *Asa* *five* full years were not completed. 2. A great error, and not a mere numerical one, is found in 2 Kings i. 17, which makes Jehoahaz king of Israel come to the throne in the second year of his namesake of Judah, whom he really preceded by four full years (viii. 16). 3. Uzziah cannot have succeeded in the 27th year of Jeroboam II., otherwise his father's reign would be more than 14 + 26 years. The number 27 is variously corrected to 14, 16, and 17. 4. The 41 years' reign of Jeroboam II. cannot be correct. Interpreters in general choose to imagine an interregnum of 11 years between Jeroboam and his son, which is contrary to the plain meaning of the text, and intrinsically improbable after an eminently prosperous reign. A well-known and able writer even dilates on the '11 years of anarchy and civil strife' as a proved fact of great moment in the history! But to invent facts of this sort in deference to a mere number, where so many numbers are not trustworthy, and with violence to the narrative, is highly objectionable. 5. Similar remarks apply to the interregnum invented after the death of Pekah. Of his murderer it is written (2 Kings xv. 30), 'he slew him and reigned in his stead;' which certainly does not hint at an anarchy of nine years between. If Hoshea could not immediately force himself into the vacant throne, he was not likely to survive his daring deed for so many years, and then effect his purpose. The *date*, however, in that verse is quite untenable. It places the murder in the 20th year of Jotham; but Jotham reigned only 16 years, and Pekah survived him (xvi. 5). The date in another text (xv. 27), which assigns to Pekah 20 years of reign, must also be rejected, in preference to tampering with the historical facts.

Counting downwards from Jehoahaz of Israel, and representing fractional parts of years by Greek letters:—

Jehoahaz of Israel . . .	0	
Amaziah . . . . .	1 + $\alpha$	} 15 + $\alpha$ + $\beta$
Jeroboam . . . . .		
Uzziah . . . . .	29 + $\alpha$ + $\gamma$	
Zachariah . . . . .	66 + $\alpha$ + $\gamma$ + $\delta$	

It is hence easy to see that Jeroboam reigned more than 50 full years, and certainly less than 52: it is probable then that the 41 years assigned to him ought to be 51. Assuming this, it will follow that Uzziah followed Jeroboam by less than 14 full years; so that 'the 27th,' in 2 Kings xv. 1, will need to be corrected 'the 14th.' It cannot be made greater than 15th, consistently with the other date, even if Jeroboam's reign be prolonged into a 52nd or 53rd year, by throwing it as early as possible, and that of Zachariah as late as possible.

Pekah will have reigned more than 27 and less than 29 full years, if we correct the date of Hezekiah's accession, with Winer and Clinton, as above noticed. If, on the contrary, we alter the accession of Hoshea to the 13th or 14th year of Ahaz, Pekah's reign exceeds 28, but is less than 31 years. If we suppose 30 more likely to have been corrupted into 20, than 28 or 29, we may choose this alternative.

So much being premised, it readily appears that from Jehu to Uzziah is more than 73 years, and less than 76; thus:—

	Years.	Mnths.	Years.	Mnths.
Jehu . . . . .	0	0	0	0
Jehoahaz . . . . .	6	1 or	6	11
Amaziah . . . . .	45	2	46	10
Uzziah . . . . .	73	3	75	9

and that from Uzziah to the capture of Samaria is more than 88, and less than 91 years:—

	Years.	Mnths.	Years.	Mnths.
Uzziah . . . . .	0	0	0	0
Jotham . . . . .	52	2 or	52	11
Ahaz . . . . .	67	3	68	10
Hezekiah . . . . .	82	4	83	9
Samaria taken . . . . .	88	5	90	8

From Jehu to the capture of Samaria then is more than 161 years, and less than 167: finally, the whole period of the Israelitish monarchy lies between the limits of 249 and 259 years. Since positive truth is here unattainable, it does not appear worth while to disturb (as a whole) any received chronological system: it is enough to mark (when possible) the limits of error. The date of the capture of Samaria now most received is *a.c.* 721; yet this is arrived at through the reigns of the early Persian kings, and without any very satisfactory check upon error.

The following scheme of chronology agrees with Winer in its total range, but has minor changes by a single unit in some of the kings:—

Rehoboam . . . . .	975	Jeroboam . . . . .	n.c.
Abijah . . . . .	957		
Asa . . . . .	955		
	954	Nadab . . . . .	
	952	Baasha . . . . .	
	929	Elah . . . . .	
	928	Zimri, Omri . . . . .	

	B.C.	
Jehoshaphat . . .	917	Ahab.
	914	
	897	Ahaziah.
	896	Jehoram.
Jehoram . . .	889	
Ahaziah . . .	885	
Queen Athaliah . . .	884	Jehu.
Jehoash . . .	878	
	855	Jehoahaz.
	840	Jehoash.
Amaziah . . .	838	
	824	Jeroboam II.
Uzziah . . .	809	
	772	Zachariah.
	771	Shallum, Menahem.
	760	Pekahiah.
	758	Pekah.
Jotham . . .	757	
Ahaz . . .	741	
	729	Hoshea.
Hezekiah . . .	726	
	721	Samaria captured.

The dynasties in Israel are denoted by brackets.

Leaving the subject of chronology, we pass to the substance of the history.

Jeroboam originally fixed on *Shechem* as the centre of his monarchy, and fortified it; moved perhaps not only by its natural suitability, but by the remembrances of Jacob which clove to it, and by the auspicious fact that here first Israel had decided for him against Rehoboam. But the natural delightfulness of *Tirzah* (Cant. vi. 4) led him, perhaps late in his reign, to erect a palace there (1 Kings xiv. 17). After the murder of Jeroboam's son, Baasha seems to have intended to fix his capital at *Ramah*, as a convenient place for annoying the king of Judah, whom he looked on as his only dangerous enemy; but when forced to renounce this plan (xv. 17, 21), he acquiesced in *Tirzah*, which continued to be the chief city of Israel, until Omri, who, since the palace at *Tirzah* had been burned during the civil war (1 Kings xvi. 18), built *Samaria*, with the ambition not uncommon in the founder of a new dynasty (xvi. 24). *Samaria* continued to the end of the monarchy to be the centre of administration; and its strength appears to have justified Omri's choice. For details, see *SAMARIA*; also *TIRZAH* and *SHECHEM*.

There is reason to believe that Jeroboam carried back with him into Israel the good will, if not the substantial assistance, of Shishak; and this will account for his escaping the storm from Egypt which swept over Rehoboam in his fifth year. During that first period Israel was far from quiet within. Although the ten tribes collectively had decided in favour of Jeroboam, great numbers of individuals remained attached to the family of David, and to the worship at Jerusalem, and in the three first years of Rehoboam migrated into Judah (2 Chron. xi. 16, 17). Perhaps it was not until this process commenced, that Jeroboam was worked up to the desperate measure of erecting rival sanctuaries with visible idols (1 Kings xii. 27): a measure which met the usual ill-success of profane state-craft, and aggravated the evil which he feared. It set him at war with the whole order of priests and Levites, whose expulsion or subjugation,

we may be certain, was not effected without convulsing his whole kingdom, and so occupying him as to free Rehoboam from any real danger, although no peace was made. The king of Judah improved the time by immense efforts in fortifying his territory (2 Chron. xi. 5-11); and, although Shishak soon after carried off the most valuable spoil, no great or definite impression could be made by Jeroboam. Israel having so far taken the place of heathen nations, and being already perhaps even in alliance with Egypt, at an early period—we know not how soon—sought and obtained the friendship of the kings of Damascus. A sense of the great advantage derivable from such a union seems to have led Ahab afterwards to behave with mildness and conciliation towards Benhadad, at a time when it could have been least expected (1 Kings xx. 31-34). From that transaction we learn that Benhadad I. had made in Damascus 'streets for Omri,' and Omri for Benhadad in Samaria. This, no doubt, implied that 'a quarter' was assigned for Syrian merchants in Samaria, which was probably fortified like the 'camp of the Tyrians' in Memphis, or the English factory at Calcutta; and in it, of course, Syrian worship would be tolerated. Against such intercourse the prophets, as might be expected, entered their protest (ver. 35-43); but it was in many ways too profitable to be renounced. In the reign of Baasha, Asa king of Judah, sensible of the dangerous advantage gained by his rival through the friendship of the Syrians, determined to buy them off at any price [see also under *JUDAH*]; and by sacrificing 'the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king's house' (xv. 18), induced Benhadad I. to break his league with Baasha and to ravage all the northern district of Israel. This drew off the Israelitish monarch, and enabled Asa to destroy the fortifications of Ramah, which would have stopped the course of his trade (xv. 17), perhaps that with the sea-coast and with Tyre. Such was the beginning of the war between *Israel* and *Syria*, on which the safety of Judah at that time depended. Cordial union was not again restored between the two northern states until the days of Rezin king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, when Damascus must have already felt the rising power of Nineveh. The renewed alliance instantly proved so disastrous to Judah, which was reduced to extreme straits (Isa. vii. 2; 2 Kings xv. 37; 2 Chron. xxviii. 5, 6), as may seem to justify at least the *policy* of Asa's proceeding. Although it was impossible for a prophet to approve of it (2 Chron. xvi. 7), we may only so much the more infer that Judah was already brought into most pressing difficulties, and that the general course of the war, in spite of occasional reverses, was decidedly and increasingly favourable to Israel.

The wars of Syria and Israel were carried on chiefly under three reigns, those of Benhadad II., Hazael, and Benhadad III., the two first monarchs being generally prosperous, especially Hazael, the last being as decidedly unsuccessful. Although these results may have depended in part on personal qualities, there is high probability that the feebleness displayed by the Syrians against Jehoahaz and his son Jeroboam was occasioned by the pressure of the advancing empire of Nineveh. To make this clear, a small table of synchronisms

B.C.	SYRIA.	B.C.	ASSYRIA.
900?	Rezon.	1050	Nineveh unable to resist the king of Zobah, and quite unheard of in Palestine.
900?	Hirien.		
900?	Tabrimon.		
940	Benhadad I.	940	Nineveh still unable to interfere with the Syrians, but <i>perhaps</i> beginning to rise into empire by the conquest of Media and Babylon.
910?	Benhadad II.		
885	Hazael.		
845	Benhadad III.	850	Assyria undoubtedly coming forward into great power.
800?	[Damascus taken by Jeroboam II.]	800	Assyria probably in possession of Northern Syria.
758	Rezin.	765?	The king of Assyria marches for the first time into Israel.

representing the two heathen powers may be serviceable. The dates are only approximate.

Asa adhered, through the whole of his long reign, to the policy of encouraging hostility between the two northern kingdoms; and the first Benhadad had such a career of success that his son found himself in a condition to hope for an entire conquest of Israel. His formidable invasions wrought an entire change in the mind of Jehoshaphat (1 Kings xxii. 44), who saw that if Israel was swallowed up by Syria there would be no safety for Judah. We may conjecture that this consideration determined him to unite the two royal families; for no common cause would have induced so religious a king to select for his son's wife Athaliah the daughter of Jezebel. The age of Ahaziah, who was sprung from this marriage, forces us to place it as early as B.C. 912, which is the third year of Jehoshaphat and sixth of Ahab. Late in his reign Jehoshaphat threw himself most cordially (1 Kings xxii. 4) into the defence of Ahab, and by so doing probably saved Israel from a foreign yoke. Another mark of the low state into which both kingdoms were falling, is, that after Ahab's death the Moabites refused their usual tribute to Israel, and (as far as can be made out from the ambiguous words of 2 Kings iii. 27) the united force of the two kingdoms failed of doing more than irritate them. Soon after, in the reign of Jehoram son of Jehoshaphat, the Edomites followed the example, and established their independence. This event possibly engaged the whole force of Judah, and hindered it from succouring Samaria during the cruel siege which it sustained from Benhadad II., in the reign of Jehoram son of Ahab. The declining years and health of the king of Syria gave a short respite to Israel; but, in B.C. 885, Hazael, by defeating the united Hebrew armies, commenced the career of conquest and harassing invasion by which he 'made Israel like the dust by threshing.' Even under Jehu he subdued the trans-Jordanic tribes (2 Kings x. 32). Afterwards, since he took the town of Gath (2 Kings xii. 17) and prepared to attack Jerusalem—an attack which Jehoshaphat king of Judah averted only by strictly following Asa's precedent—it is manifest that all the passes and chief forts of the country west of

the Jordan must have been in his hand. Indeed, as he is said 'to have left to Jehoahaz only fifty horsemen, ten chariots, and ten thousand footmen,' it would seem that Israel was strictly a conquered province, in which Hazael dictated (as the English to the native rajahs of India) what military force should be kept up. From this thralldom Israel was delivered by some unexplained agency. We are told merely that 'Jehovah gave to Israel a saviour, so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians; and the children of Israel dwelt in their tents as beforetime,' 2 Kings xiii. 5. It is allowable to conjecture that the (apparently unknown) deliverer was the Assyrian monarchy, which, assailing Hazael towards the end of the reign of Jehoahaz, entirely drew away the Syrian armies. That it was some urgent, powerful, and continued pressure, considering the great strength which the empire of Damascus had attained, seems clear from the sudden weakness of Syria through the reigns of Jehoash and Jeroboam II., the former of whom thrice defeated Benhadad III. and 'recovered the cities of Israel;' the latter not only regained the full territory of the sterner tribes, but made himself master (for a time at least) of Damascus and Hamath. How entirely the friendship of Israel and Judah had been caused and cemented by their common fear of Syria, is proved by the fact that no sooner is the power of Damascus broken than new war breaks out between the two kingdoms, which ended in the plunder of Jerusalem by Jehoash, who also broke down its walls and carried off hostages; after which there is no more alliance between Judah and Israel. The empire of Damascus seems to have been entirely dissolved under the son of Hazael, and no mention is made of its kings for eighty years or more. When Pekah, son of Remaliah, reigned in Samaria, Rezin, as king of Damascus, made a last but ineffectual effort for its independence.

The same Assyrian power which had doubtless so seriously shaken, and perhaps temporarily overturned, the kingdom of Damascus, was soon to be felt by Israel. Menahem was invaded by Pul (the first sovereign of Nineveh whose name we know), and was made tributary. His successor, Tiglath-pileser, in the reign of Pekah, son of

**Benadiah**, carried captive the eastern and northern tribes of Israel (i. e. perhaps all their chief men as hostages?), and soon after slew Rezin, the ally of Pekah, and subdued Damascus. The following emperor, Shalmanezzer, besieged and captured Samaria, and terminated the kingdom of Israel, *b. c.* 721.

This branch of the Hebrew monarchy suffered far greater and more rapid reverses than the other. From the accession of Jeroboam to the middle of Baasha's reign it probably increased in power; it then waned with the growth of the Damascene empire; it struggled hard against it under Ahab and Jehoram, but sank lower and lower; it was dismembered under Jehu, and made subject under Jehoahaz. From *b. c.* 940 to *b. c.* 850 is, as nearly as can be ascertained, the period of depression; and from *b. c.* 914 to *b. c.* 830 that of friendship or alliance with Judah. But after (about) *b. c.* 850 Syria began to decline, and Israel soon shot out rapidly; so that Joash and his son Jeroboam appear, of all Hebrew monarchs, to come next to David and Solomon. How long this burst of prosperity lasted does not distinctly appear; but it would seem that entire dominion over the ten tribes was held until Pekah received the first blow from the Assyrian conqueror.

Besides that which was a source of weakness to Israel from the beginning, *viz.* the schism of the crown with the whole ecclesiastical body, other causes may be discerned which made the ten tribes less powerful, in comparison with the two, than might have been expected. The marriage of Ahab to Jezebel brought with it no political advantages at all commensurate with the direct moral mischief, to say nothing of the spiritual evil; and the reaction against the worship of Baal was a most ruinous atonement for the sin. To suppress the monstrous iniquity, the prophets let loose the remorseless Jehu, who, not satisfied with the blood of Ahab's wife, grandson, and seventy sons, murdered first the king of Judah himself, and next forty-two youthful and innocent princes of his house; while, strange to tell, the daughter of Jezebel gained by his deed the throne of Judah, and perpetrated a new massacre. The horror of such crimes must have fallen heavily on Jehu, and have caused a wide-spread disaffection among his own subjects. Add to this, that the Phœnicians must have deeply resented his proceedings; so that we get a very sufficient clue to the prostration of Israel under the foot of Hazael during the reign of Jehu and his son.

Another and more abiding cause of political debility in the ten tribes was found in the imperfect consolidation of the inhabitants into a single nation. Since those who lived east of the Jordan retained, to a great extent at least, their pastoral habits, their union with the rest could never have been very firm; and when a king was neither strong independently of them, nor had good hereditary pretensions, they were not likely to contribute much to his power. After their conquest of the Hagarenes and the depression of the Moabites and Ammonites by David, they had free room to spread eastward; and many of their chief men may have become wealthy in flocks and herds (like Machir the son of Ammiel, of Leshbar, and Barzillai the Gileadite, 2 Sam. xvii. 27), over whom the authority of the Israelitish crown would naturally be precarious; while

west of the Jordan the agrarian law of Moses made it difficult or impossible for a landed nobility to form itself, which could be formidable to the royal authority. That the Arab spirit of freedom was rooted in the eastern tribes, may perhaps be inferred from the case of the Rechabites, who would neither live in houses nor plant vines; undoubtedly, like some of the Nabatheans, lest by becoming settled and agricultural they should be enslaved. Yet the need of imposing this law on his descendants would not have been felt by Jonadab, had not an opposite tendency been rising,—that of agricultural settlement.

On another point our information is defective, *viz.* what proportion of the inhabitants of the land consisted of foreign slaves, or subject and degraded castes [SOLOMON]. Such as belonged to tribes who practised circumcision [CIRCUMCISION] would with less difficulty become incorporated with the Israelites; but the Philistines who were intermixed with Israel, by resisting this ordinance, must have continued heterogeneous. In 1 Kings xv. 27; xvi. 16, we find the town of Gibeon in the hand of the Philistines during the reigns of Nadab, Baasha, and Zimri: nor is it stated that they were finally expelled. Gibeon being a Levitical town, it might be conjectured that it had been occupied by the Philistines when the Levites emigrated into Judah; but the possibilities here are many.

Although the priests and Levites nearly disappeared out of Israel, prophets were perhaps even more numerous and active there than in Judah, and Abijah, whose prediction first endangered Jeroboam (1 Kings xi. 29-40), lived in honour at Shiloh to his dying day (xiv. 2). Obadiah alone saved one hundred prophets of Jehovah from the rage of Jezebel (xviii. 13). Possibly their extra-social character freed them from the restraint imposed on priests and Levites; and while they felt less bound to the formal rites of the Law, the kings of Israel were also less jealous of them. In fact, just as a great cathedral in Christendom tends to elevate the priestly above the prophetic functions, so, it is possible, did the proximity of Jerusalem; and the prophet may have moved most freely where he came least into contact with the priest. That most inauspicious event—the rupture of Israel with Judah—may thus have been overruled for the highest blessing of the world, by a fuller development of the prophetic spirit.

F. W. N.

1. ISSACHAR (יִשָּׂשַׁר, Sept. Ἰσάχαρ), a son of Jacob and Leah, born *b. c.* 1749, who gave name to one of the tribes of Israel (Gen. xxx. 18; Num. xxvi. 25).

2. The tribe called after Issachar. Jacob, on his death-bed, speaking metaphorically of the character and destinies of his sons, or rather of the tribes which should spring from them, said, 'Issachar is a strong ass couching down between two burdens' (Gen. xlix. 14, 15). Remembering the character of the ass in eastern countries, we may be sure that this comparison was not intended in disparagement. The ass is anything but stupid; and the proverbial obtuseness which it sometimes exhibits in our own country, is rather the result of ill-treatment than a natural characteristic of the animal. Its true attributes are