

The Works of
Francis William Newman
on Religion

A Critical Edition

Vol. I

A History of the Hebrew Monarchy

with

Afterthoughts

Introduction by Tod E. Jones,
Editor

FW Newman

© The Francis William Newman Research Center, 2011
ISBN 978-0-9834497-0-6

Published electronically, without editorial introduction, in 2009,
ISBN 978-1-8896807-5-0,
by The Philosophy Documentation Center (www.pdcnet.org).
This searchable e-text remains available through subscription to
The Works of Francis William Newman on Religion: A Critical Edition

Please visit the Francis William Newman Research Center online at
www.fwnewman.org

The Works of
Francis William Newman
on Religion

A Critical Edition
Vol. I

Contents

Editor's Introduction	i
A History of the Hebrew Monarchy	1
Afterthoughts	
On the 51st Psalm	359
Alleged Murder of Uriah	361
Some Considerations concerning Psalm 51	365
Bibliography	369
Index	371

Editor's Introduction

“The author of the *History of the Hebrew Monarchy* has brought a very acute mind, familiar with knowledge that lies beyond the range of ordinary scholarship, to the task of combining and interpreting the antique and fragmentary records, which contain the only materials for his work. The facts so elicited, he has read in the clear light of modern intelligence and humanity, and without hesitation or disguise has estimated at their just moral value.”

—John James Taylor,¹
Professor of Ecclesiastical History,
Manchester New College, 1848.

“If some impression has been made on the minds of a few thoughtful and serious persons by the perusal of Mr. Newman's *Hebrew Monarchy*, it must be ascribed rather to the author's reputation for ability and learning, than to any evidence of either which the volume itself affords.”

—Richard Whately,²
Archbishop, Church of England,
Dublin, 1851.

“As a mere statement of facts, it is mainly well enough, and when wrong may be set right by a reference to the original records; but in its criticism upon the sources from which those facts are drawn, in its judgments upon the characters and actions which pass before us in the course of his narrative, in its allusions to other portions of the word of God, in its whole theory of the divine economy of the Old Testament, and its relation to the gospel, it is only evil and that continually. It could not well be more ruinous than it is.”

—Anonymous American Reviewer,
1851.³

“Mr. Francis Newman, in his *Hebrew Monarchy*, is historically consistent in his expositions, which have not been controverted by any serious argument; but his mind seems to fail in the Ideal element; else he would see, that the typical ideas (of patience or of glory) in the Old Testament, find their culminating fulfilment in the New.”

—Rowland Williams,⁴
 Professor of Hebrew,
 St. David’s College, Lampeter, 1860.

“His *History of the Hebrew Monarchy*, written about the middle of the century, . . . remains to this day one of the clearest and most interesting and authoritative accounts of that people. To most readers of the time of its first publication it must have seemed a daringly iconoclastic work, and even now there are many who would follow some of its pages with bated breath. Yet neither its fairness, its lack of prejudice, nor its scholarly foundations can be in question, and combined with these traits it has qualities of style which must give it a lasting value for the popular reader.”

—Thomas Kelly Cheyne,⁵
 Professor of Scripture Interpretation,
 Oriel College, Oxford, 1908.

I.

The remarks of T. K. Cheyne—which conclude the above catena of critical responses to F. W. Newman’s *History of the Hebrew Monarchy, from the Administration of Samuel to the Babylonish Captivity*—were made sixty years after its initial publication in 1847 and, with little emendation, could be repeated today. Any reader who wants a quick overview of the biblical history based upon critical foundations, without the abundance of detail and explanations necessary to establish those foundations, who wants an author that is capable of appreciating and empathizing with the religious and moral sentiment found within the biblical text, without attempting to read that text as invariably religious and moral, who wants an author to be critical of apologetic readings of the text, without ever expressing himself in language that is vulgar, flippant, or sarcastic,—any reader who is looking for these qualities, rare in combination, will particularly welcome Newman’s *History*. Even so, these were the same qualities that made this work appear to contemporary Christian readers as peculiarly dangerous.

Newman made available to the average educated English reader the results of the most advanced contemporary Old Testament scholarship. Had Newman taken

the trouble to re-establish the critical foundations upon which his work was built, his narrative would have lost its brevity and flow. It would have required publication in multiple volumes and would have been of interest only to an academic audience. But, with much of the latest critical scholarship on the Bible already translated into English, Newman recognized that, for the popular reader, the pressing need was an application, not a reiteration, of that scholarship. At the same time, Newman was also aware that he had to provide sufficient detail and references to support the credibility of his interpretive reading. His task was to strike a balance between these two, somewhat opposite, necessities, and modern readers will generally concur that he accomplished this task quite well. Newman's approach, however, made it possible for his evangelical critics to dismiss his work on the grounds that he had not established the critical presuppositions upon which it is based. He had failed to prove, for example, that the biblical accounts of miraculous events could not be read as history; moreover, he had made use of the conclusions of modern textual criticism—such as the distinction between Isaiah and the later prophet whose work is appended to Isaiah's—without first clearly demonstrating the bases of those conclusions. The common evangelical complaint was, in other words, that Newman had run too fast and too far ahead.

Had the *History of the Hebrew Monarchy* been written by one without evident religious sensibilities and moral earnestness, its conclusions could have been dismissed not only as unproven, but as being, in fact, no more than postulates of atheism or infidelity. Newman, however, had demonstrated that the results of the most modern biblical scholarship, destructive to traditional or orthodox notions, could be maintained without injury to theism, religious devotion, and morals. This made the *History* seem particularly dangerous to evangelicals who believed their relationship with God dependant upon particular convictions regarding biblical inspiration and inerrancy. Since Newman appeared to be offering assurances that the fruit of higher criticism would in no way diminish the love of God, as manifested in goodness and truth, but—on the contrary—only provide clarity in recognizing these attributes, evangelical leaders felt called upon to denounce the *History* as the serpent's declaration "Ye shall *not* surely die!" (Gen. 3. 4). Loyalty to the faith of their fathers demanded that they stop their ears, turn their heads, and denounce the voice that threatened to beguile them. In fact, Newman's subsequent history, his renunciation of the name "Christian" and his public assault on the doctrine of the moral perfection of Jesus, appeared to justify their reaction and reinforced, as a Christian duty, their commitment never to read anything from his pen.

This evangelical boycott of Newman's works, mainly supported through misrepresentation and prejudice, explains why Cheyne entirely avoided any mention of the *History* in his *Founders of Old Testament Criticism* (1893). Initially we may suppose that, as Cheyne's influential series of studies is limited to a discussion of

“founders,” and as Newman was not so much a founder as a popularizer, Cheyne had no suitable opportunity to introduce the *History* into his book. But when we read the following, we are forced to confess that this supposition, however plausible, cannot stand:

We have already seen that at the end of the eighteenth century a Cambridge professor (H. Lloyd) attempted to obtain episcopal and academical sanction for a translation of Eichhorn’s *Introduction to the Old Testament*. To his great surprise (but not to ours) the attempt failed. . . . At length, in 1862, the hour came, and the man; and, strange to say, the champion was a bishop—and though neither a great Hebrew scholar, nor a critic trained in historical investigations, he was at any rate free from the influences adverse to history which proceeded from the philosophy of Coleridge. It was John William Colenso who reopened the suspended intercourse between the critical students of England and the continent; for I shall hardly be called upon to admit that the timid adherence of Dr. Samuel Davidson in 1859 to the critical analysis of the Pentateuch in some not very clearly defined form entitles him to a higher title (at least in the present connexion) than that of a precursor.⁶

There is nothing timid in Newman’s adherence to the principles of the higher criticism, and yet it would appear that Newman does not even warrant recognition as a “precursor.” In fact, a reader unfamiliar with the later remarks by Cheyne might easily assume that, in his estimation, the *History* is insignificant. At any rate, the honor of reopening the critical intercourse of biblical scholarship—suspended since the decline of British deism—is awarded without hesitation to Colenso. The reader should observe, however, that Cheyne’s purpose in these studies is to diminish the apprehension felt by his Oxford students toward advanced biblical criticism. Several passages suggest that the most the professor could hope to accomplish was to persuade his students to read the profound, yet eminently ecclesiastical, Ewald.⁷ With this end in view, it was entirely in Cheyne’s interest to exaggerate the importance of the Bishop of Natal and to ignore the more radical and controversial Newman. Indeed, had Cheyne, in the context of these studies, given to Newman’s *History* the praise he afterwards felt free to bestow upon it, he would have risked forfeiting his students’ trust, solidifying their prejudices, and failing in his object. Thus, Cheyne’s *Founders* cannot be fairly appealed to as derogating from the significance of Newman; rather, it merely confirms what we already know of his reputation.

Scientists and abstract philosophers can never run so fast or so far in advance that time will not catch up. If ignored and vilified in their own age, they will be honored and vindicated in the next. This observation cannot be made in regard to philosophical historians. Their philosophy may be in advance of their age, but their history, when most advanced, is never more than current—for history deals in the

concrete and cannot anticipate the research and findings of tomorrow—and when the spirit of the age catches up to their philosophy, it finds their history no longer current. For illustration of this point, we need only consider Newman's treatment of 2 Kings 6.8–7.6. Newman finds the whole account of the Syrian (Aramæan) siege of Samaria to be historically unreliable, and when the biblical narrator pretends to account for the Syrian's sudden lifting of the siege by positing rumor of a Hittite advance, Newman thinks the narrator merely guessing. In a footnote, our author adds, "No Hittite kings can have compared in power with the king of Judah."⁸ This was a rash and gratuitous remark, and when, in the 1860s, cuneiform inscriptions at Hamath were discovered to refer to the Hittites as a military power contemporary with the Syrian threat, Newman's evangelical adversaries were delighted. They castigated Newman as unreasonably prejudiced against the veracity of the biblical narrator, and heralded the inscriptions as proving the historical reliability of the Bible.⁹ But this is not the end of the story. The archaeological and literary research of the past one hundred and fifty years has added much to our knowledge of the period and its peoples. In general, it has vindicated Newman's historical skepticism, and for some of the same reasons to which Newman had alluded. As the narrative of the siege falls within a series of disconnected anecdotes about Elisha, it necessarily is tainted by the legendary and mythical character of those stories. Moreover, Newman's simple observation that the text often refers to "king of Israel" or "king of Judah" without identifying any particular monarch has, more recently, been developed into the theory that this want of period-specificity in the prophet stories not only facilitated their integration by the biblical compiler, but also allowed him to more artfully interweave the stories by simply replacing "king of —" with the name of whatever monarch seemed most historically appropriate. In the same way, the biblical historian used the name of a known king of Syria, "Benhadad," generically in reference to any unknown king of Syria.¹⁰ For all of these reasons, the account of the siege of Samaria cannot be read as history—despite the Hamath inscriptions. As a philosopher of history, Newman has been vindicated. Given the evidences available to him, Newman's skepticism can now be fully appreciated. But the advancements made in archaeological and anthropological science now suggests to many that the attempt to extract *any* actual history from the biblical record is vain. Thomas L. Thompson, for instance, argues that the biblical texts are "historically useful for what they imply about the author's present, and about the knowledge available to him and his contemporaries, not for their author's claim about any projected past."¹¹ Yet, Thompson's reduction of the narratives to *only* theology and literature is an extreme reaction against the "naive historical realism" of archaeologists who enter the field with spade in one hand and Bible in the other. Thompson's approach begs the questions, "*What* knowledge was available to the biblical narrators and their contemporaries? From whence did

it come? How was it originally produced?” These are questions of history, and if we ignore them by rigidly adhering to the methodological restraints suggested by Thompson, would we not be guilty of an equally naive historical nihilism?

Biblical historians are now often defined by their position relative to two extreme camps: the *maximalists*, “who accept the biblical text unless it can be proved wrong,” and the *minimalists*, “who accept the biblical text only when it can be confirmed from other sources.”¹² Most modern readers situate themselves somewhere between these extremes, and that is just where they will find Newman. The minimalist whose sole interest is in the most up-to-date extra-biblical record of ancient Israel might look elsewhere, as might also the maximalist, whose interest is in a scientifically improved synopsis of biblical history. But most of us will identify with Newman; there is a timeliness in his philosophy, and it is this timeliness that makes the spirit of *his* inquiry eminently stimulating to our own. The *History of the Hebrew Monarchy* engages, challenges, and provokes; it refuses to leave us where it found us, but politely declines to determine our destination. For the purpose of facilitating discussion among a group of young adults interested in its subject, Newman’s book is uniquely suitable and quite irreplaceable.

II.

Still, there is more to the *History of the Hebrew Monarchy* than its current relevance and utility. Taking a biographical approach, one might explore how this work fits into the context of the author’s development and life’s work, as well as how it reflects his personal experiences. A student of the religious literature of nineteenth-century Britain might also consider how Newman applies advanced biblical criticism in a concerted effort to break into pieces the idols then being worshiped on the high places of Victorian culture. A satisfactory biography of Newman has yet to be written, but the loose and scattered details we possess provide certain details and hints to aid us in a deeper appreciation of his *History*.

Francis William Newman (1805–1897), the youngest of three brothers—the oldest being John Henry, afterwards Cardinal—was the son of a London banker and freethinker, John, and his wife, Jemima (née Fourdrinier), a woman of evangelical piety and a descendant of Huguenots who had fled to England upon the repeal of the Edict of Nantes. Newman, it is fair to say, was nurtured on the Old Testament. Before he could read, its stories were associated in his mind with his mother’s sweet voice and a special book with gilded pages, filled with things ancient and wonderful and opened only in a spirit of reverence and awe.

At the age of seven Newman was sent to the preparatory school of Great Ealing, London. Within four years he was studying the Bible independently. His

dividing line between priest and prophet in the first place, and for the answer it would appear that we must look to the most defining experience of Newman's own spirituality.

It is there, in the context of Newman's early religious development, that we first took note of the two disparate paths, the one taken by John, the other by himself. Yet, neither of the brothers really chose his path so much as he was chosen by it. Characteristically, Newman accounted for the separation between himself and John by suggesting differences in "first principles" as the primary factor.⁶⁹ But Newman's experience of the division was essentially spiritual, not logical, and none of Taylor's arguments could weaken the force of what Newman *felt* from the depth of his soul to be true—that it was as impossible for any Priest (who expected Forms to command the Spirit) to become a Prophet, as it was for a Prophet (who expected the Spirit to command, if not to supercede, Forms) to become a Priest. If we accept John's account of his religious development, as given in the *Apologia pro Vita Sua* (1864), we may believe that he was made a priest, and perhaps even a Roman Catholic priest, by certain innate or God-sent impulses that guided his will. And, if we accept the account that Newman gives of his own development in *Phases of Faith* (1850), we may believe that the unremitting pressure of the divine *logos* gradually parted him from every exterior source of religious authority until, finally, he was made to listen exclusively to the interior voice of the Spirit. Unfortunately, in *Phases of Faith*, we see Newman only as he is in the school of the prophets, not as he is after graduation. But, in his subsequent life, from the publication of *The Crimes of the House of Hapsburg against Its Own Liege Subjects* (1853) to *A Christian Commonwealth* (1883), in his hundreds of articles and speeches against various abuses of political power, we see the prophet at his work. If, therefore, we would have an *Apologia* for Newman's life as a prophet, we shall find it, as in a palimpsest, within *A History of the Hebrew Monarchy*.

Notes

1. [John James Taylor,] "Hebrew History," *The Prospective Review* 13 (January 1848): 1-33, 3.

2. [Richard Whately,] "The Old Testament: Newman and Greg," *The North British Review* 16 (November 1851): 119-48, 119. Walter S. Houghton, in his *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals*, identifies Bonamy Price as the author; however, since Newman himself had a letter from the editor of the *NBR* admitting Whately's penmanship (Letter of Newman to John Chapman [28 Sept. 1857], Special Collections, Beineke Library, Yale U.), and since Newman's public declaration of the same (in the 2nd ed. of his *History* [1853]) never received a challenge, it would appear—whatever weight Houghton's source may have to the contrary—that Whately was, in fact, the author. Moreover, John Rickards Mozley, in

an article on "Professor Bonamy Price" (*Littell's Living Age* [1 September 1888]: 538-46), establishes the lifelong respect that Price had for Francis Newman as a rigorously honest truth-seeker.

3. "A History of the Hebrew Monarchy," *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 22 (April 1850): 234-60, 238.

4. Rowland Wilson, "Bunsen's Biblical Researches," in *Essays and Reviews: The 1860 Text and Its Reading*, ed. Victor Shea and William Whitla (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000), 214n.

5. Thomas Kelly Cheyne, "A Critical Survey of the Scope and Sources of Israelitic History." In *The Historians History of the World: A Comprehensive Narrative of the Rise and Development of Nations as Recorded by over Two Thousand of the Great Writers of All Ages*, ed. Henry Smith Williams. 25 vols. Vol. II: Israel, India, Persia, Phoenicia, Minor Nations of Western Asia (London: Hooper and Jackson, 1908), 234.

6. Thomas Kelly Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism: Biographical, Descriptive, and Critical Studies* (London: Methuen and Co., 1893), 195-96.

7. Cheyne, *Founders*, 67, 88, 104-05.

8. F. W. Newman, *A History of the Hebrew Monarchy*, in *The Works of Francis William Newman on Religion: A Critical Edition*, ed. Tod E. Jones, 10 vols. (Charlottesville: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2009), 1: 190-92, 192n.

9. This subject is considered in some detail in *Letters of Francis William Newman on Religion: The Braithwaite Correspondence, 1868-1897*, ed. Tod E. Jones (Charlottesville: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2009), 224-27.

10. See Lester L. Grabbe, *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* (London: T. and T. Clark, 2007), 146-49.

11. Thomas L. Thompson, *The Mythic Past: Biblical Archaeology and the Myth of Israel* (London: Basic Books, 1999), 10.

12. Grabbe, *op. cit.*, 23.

13. Very likely, it was Mayers who introduced Newman to John Parkhurst's *Hebrew and English Lexicon, without Points: In Which the Hebrew and Chaldee Words of the Old Testament Are Explained in Their Leading and Derived Senses* (1762; 3rd ed., 1792). See F. W. Newman, *A Personal Narrative, in Letters, Principally from Turkey, in the Years 1830-3* (London: Holyoake and Co., 1856), 15, 36.

14. F. W. Newman, *Phases of Faith*, in *Works*, 3: 7.

15. *Ibid.*, 3: 8.

16. *Ibid.*

17. *Ibid.*, 3: 9; cf. *Works*, 7: 54n.

18. *Ibid.*, 3: 10.

19. *Discourses on Prophecy, in Which Are Considered Its Structure, Use, and Inspiration: Being the Substance of Twelve Sermons Preached in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn, in the Lecture Founded by the Right Reverend William Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester* (London: John Murray, 1824). In "On Jewish Proselytism before the War of Titus" (1878) Newman mistakenly identifies these sermons as Bampton Lectures (*Works*, 6: 108).

A
HISTORY
OF
THE HEBREW MONARCHY
FROM THE
ADMINISTRATION OF SAMUEL
TO THE
BABYLONISH CAPTIVITY.

1847, 1853, 1865

PREFACES

FIRST EDITION.

*

FEW words of introduction are needed to the following attempt to depict more vividly the real state and fortunes of the Hebrew people under their native kings. The documents are in the hands of us all; but, owing to their scattered nature, it is a very laborious task to combine them into a single point of view, and deduce from meagre notices anything like an historical representation. 5

A political history of the Hebrews is no doubt primarily to be here expected; but to omit on that account the narrative of their religious concerns, would be as absurd as to take no notice of Poetry, Art, and Philosophy in a history of Greece. The whole value of Hebrew history to us turns upon the Hebrew religion. No reader must therefore be surprised to find the writer dilate 10 on solemn and profound topics, which would generally be out of place in ordinary history. On the other hand, as we have to deal with human fortunes, guaranteed to us by the evidence of documents which bear plentiful marks of the human mind and hand, we cannot dispense with a free and full criticism of these. And in criticizing, we have no choice but to proceed by those laws 15 of thought and of reasoning, which in all the sciences have now received currency. We advance from the known towards the unknown. We assume that human nature is like itself; and interpret the men of early ages by our more intimate knowledge of contemporary and recent times, yet making allowance for the difference of circumstances. Much more do we believe that GOD is 20 always like himself, and that whatever are his moral attributes now and his consequent judgment of human conduct, such were they then and at all times. Nor ought we to question that the relations between the divine and the human mind are still substantially the same as ever, *until* we find this obvious presumption utterly to fail in accounting for the facts presented to our examination. 25

[This Preface was omitted in the 3rd (1865) ed.]

*

[italics added, 2nd ed.]

24

We explain all the phænomena by known causes, *in preference*¹ to inventing unknown ones; and when one anomaly after another is found gradually to be cleared up by patient research and a world of reality to evolve itself before the mind, fresh confirmation is added to the grand principles of modern philosophy, which experience proves alone to lead to self-consistent, harmonious results.

Cautious reasoners may need to be reminded, that although the mind of the Jews, as that of all nations, was liable to produce legends and *mythi*, under circumstances conducive to these, yet the portion of history with which we are here concerned has little properly mythical in it. We are engaged with an epoch, all the great outlines of which were preserved by the prose chronicling of contemporaries. From king David downwards, court-annals were kept, sometimes perhaps very dry and scanty, yet not the less authentic. With these were combined occasionally the writings of prophets, or the traditions of prophetic schools. Where the originals have perished, we have nevertheless relics of them in the books which are now called Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. The actual compilation of the books of Samuel was probably earlier than that of "Kings," but we do not know the exact date. The "Kings," to judge by their closing words, were compiled in the late Babylonian exile. The Chronicles are much later, and in an imperfect genealogy bring down the line of Jeconiah (who was carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar) to a very low period of time.² Account must be taken of all such facts in balancing authorities; and when we find a wide difference of spirit between the two historians in treating the same subject,—a difference conformable to the different æras in which they write,—the great caution with which the later authority must be used will become evident. But on all such matters, the following pages will speak best for themselves in detail.

1. The above has been falsely interpreted, as though I started from the assumption that "no evidence can prove a Miracle." This is not a proposition of any practical value to me. I regard it as either a Truism or a Falsehood according to the definition of the word Miracle. I merely hold, that the stranger the alleged event, the more cogent is the evidence to be demanded. The Uniformity of Nature is not with me a primitive axiom, but a result gradually won. It does not supersede, *for it is built upon*, historical criticism and cumulative experience.

2. 1 Chron. iii. 17-24; Jeconiah, father of Pedaiah, father of Zerubbabel, father of Hananiah, father of Pelatiah [a chasm], father of Shechaniah, father of Shemaiah, father of Neariah, father of Elioenai, father of Hodaiah.

A thoughtful and conscientious reader will probably meet here many things which have before passed across his mind, but have been rejected under the idea, that if they were all true, they would surely be well known to professed divines. But let him be assured, there is not the same apathy and ignorance concerning the Old Testament, in the German, as in the English Universities. If the Hebrew history has hitherto been nearly as a sealed book to us, it is because all the academical and clerical teachers of it are compelled to sign Thirty-nine Articles of Religion before assuming their office. It is *not* easy to conceive how little we might know of Greek history, if, from the revival of Greek studies, test-articles had been imposed with a view to perpetuate the ideas of it current in the fifteenth century; but it is *very* easy to assure ourselves that neither Thirlwall nor Grote could have produced their valuable works under such a restriction. Until the laity strike off these fetters from the clergy, it is mere hypocrisy in them to defer to a clergyman's authority in any theological question of first-rate importance. We dictate to the clergy from their early youth what they are to believe, and thereby deprive them of the power of bearing independent testimony to it in their mature years. Moreover, so has the study of the Bible been crippled by the classical and mathematical system, that in this country little interest has been felt in our subject; and the Biblical critic is perpetually driven to the learned Germans for aid.

One sentiment the writer desires to express most emphatically. True Religion consists in elevated notions of God, right affections and a pure conscience towards Him, but certainly *not* in prostrating the mind to a system of dogmatic History. Those who call *this* religion are (in the writer's belief) as much in the dark as those who place it in magical sacraments and outward purifications. But while utterly renouncing both these false and injurious representations, he desires his book to carry on its front his most intense conviction, that pure and undefiled religion is the noblest, the most blessed, the most valuable of all God's countless gifts; that a heart to fear and love Him is a possession sweeter than dignities and loftier than talents; and that although the outward Form of truths held sacred by good men is destined to be remodelled by the progress of knowledge, yet in their deeper essence there is a Spirit which will live more energetically with the growth of all that is most precious and glorious in man.

May, 1847.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHAPTER I.	19
THE LAND AND TRIBES OF ISRAEL.—AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—THE BORDER COUNTRIES.	
Land of Israel.—The Jordan and the Eastern Tribes.—The Northern Tribes.—The Central Tribes.—The Southern Tribes.—Mosaic Agriculturalism.—The Levites. —Polygamy.—The Neighbouring Nations.	
CHAPTER II.	39
ADMINISTRATION OF SAMUEL AND REIGN OF SAUL.	
The Philistines.—Hebrew monotheism.—Administration of Samuel.—Early Hebrew psalmody.—Exterior marks of the Prophet.—Modes of divination.—Foreign dangers of Israel.—Appointment of Saul.—Romantic Philistine campaign.— Ammonite inroad.—Enmity with Amalek.—Massacre of the Amalekites.—David, anointed by Samuel.—David, Saul's armour-bearer.—David, Saul's son-in-law. —David, a freebooter.—David with Achish of Gath.—David reinforced from Israel.—David's return to Ziklag.—Battle of Mount Gilboa.	

CHAPTER III.

REIGN OF DAVID.

David, king in Hebron.—Battle near Gibeon.—Murder of Abner.—Jerusalem.—State of Hebrew industry.—Conquest of Moab.—First war with the Zobahites.—Conquest of Edom.—Prosperity of David.—Ammonite war.—Destruction of the Ammonites.—Career of Absalom.—Death of Absalom.—Disgrace of Mephibosheth.—Immolation of Saul's descendants.—The pestilence.—Conspiracy of Adonijah.—Death of David.

CHAPTER IV.

REIGN OF SOLOMON.

Foreign commotions.—Political executions.—Solomon's trade by the Red Sea.—Trade over the Syrian Desert.—Visit of the Queen of Sheba.—Gold vessels of the Temple.—Building of the Temple.—Bondmen in Israel.—The Temple worship.—The Decalogue.—Dowry of an Egyptian Princess.—Solomon's idolatry.—Hostilities against Solomon.—Death of Solomon.—Chronology of the Kings.—Chronological table.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEATH OF SOLOMON
TO THE ACCESSION OF OMRI, B.C. 955-904.

Division of the Monarchy.—Calves of Dan and Bethel.—Jeroboam's neglect of Levites.—Invasion by Shishak.—Later years of Rehoboam.—Massacre of the house of Jeroboam.—Power of Damascus.—War of Baasha and Asa.—Asa's later reign.—Massacre of the house of Baasha.

CHAPTER VI.

171

THE HOUSE OF OMRI, B.C. 904-864.

Building of Samaria.—Phœnician worship in Israel.—Miracles of Elijah.—Syrian chariot warfare.—Syrian campaigns west of Jordan.—Benhadad at Ramoth Gilead.—Greatness of Jehoshaphat.—Joint war of Ahab and Jehoshaphat.—Doctrine of lying spirits.—Combined war against Moab.—Siege of Samaria.—Revolt of the Edomites.—Second battle at Ramoth.—Naboth's vineyard.—Massacres of Jehu.—Massacre by Athaliah.

CHAPTER VII.

203

THE PERIOD OF THE HOUSE OF JEHU, B.C. 864-762.

Priests and Levites in Jerusalem.—Revolution conducted by Jehoiada.—Regency of Jehoiada.—Reigns of Jehu and his son.—Dispersion of Judah and Israel.—Repairs of the Temple.—Prophecy of Joel.—Peace is bought of Hazael.—Invasion of Idumæa.—Decline of Damascus.—Victorious career of Jeroboam II.—Internal state of Israel.—Prophecy of Amos.—Uzziah's long prophecy.—Internal state of Judæa.—Genealogies of the High Priests.

CHAPTER VIII.

237

FROM THE CONQUESTS OF JEROBOAM II.
TO THE FALL OF SAMARIA, B.C. 762-721.

City of Nineveh.—New parties in Israel.—Disorganization of Israel.—Zechariah's Prophecy.—League against Judæa.—Sufferings of Judah.—Isaiah encourages Ahaz.—Fall of Damascus.—Religious character of Ahaz.—Sargon and the Philistines.—First invasion of Shalmaneser.—Revolt of Judah and of Ephraim.—Final transplanting of Israel.—Anticipations of Isaiah and Micah.—Decline of prophecy in Israel.—Rough dates of certain prophecies.

271

CHAPTER IX.

FROM THE FALL OF SAMARIA
TO THE DEATH OF JOSIAH, B.C. 721-609.

Assyrian siege of Tyre.—Hezekiah's passover.—Invasion by Sennacherib.—Ethiopian embassy.—Submission of Hezekiah.—New complication of affairs.—Renewal of hostilities.—Disasters of Sennacherib.—Hezekiah's illness.—Isaiah's prophecy concerning Egypt.—Zenith of Hebrew prophecy.—Character of Manasseh.—Paganism and persecution.—State of the Assyrian power.—Rise of scholastic learning.—Scythian irruption into Media.—Rise of the Chaldees.—Final ruin of Nineveh.—Renewal of prophecy.—Josiah's reform.—Recency of Deuteronomy.—Peculiarities of Deuteronomy.—The Pentateuch a gradual growth.—Uncritical proceedings.—False prophets in Judæa.—Contemporary Egyptian affairs.—Battle near Megiddon.

327

CHAPTER X.

CLOSE OF THE HEBREW MONARCHY.

Popular election from the Dynasty.—Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim.—Defeat of Necho at Carchemish.—Jeremiah's Political Prophecies.—Babylonian invasions.—First deportation of Jews to Babylon.—Rebellion of Zedekiah.—Destruction of Jerusalem.—Gedaliah the Babylonian Satrap.—Prophecies against Egypt.—Later School of Prophecy.—Function of the Jewish Nation.

351

APPENDIX.

HISTORY OF THE HEBREW MONARCHY.

CHAPTER I. THE LAND AND TRIBES OF ISRAEL— AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS—THE BORDER COUNTRIES.

FEW nations which have put forth a wide and enduring influence upon others, proclaim themselves to have been indigenous¹ on the land of their celebrity. Tradition for the most part points back to a time at which they dispossessed earlier inhabitants, who, as hereditary enemies, are sure to be drawn in unfavourable colours, whether as unfaithful allies, brutish savages, ferocious giants, or again, as impure, heretical, or atheistical unbelievers. Where the country consists of extensive plains, with no frontier difficult to pass, its older occupants more readily migrate under the pressure of an enemy, and the whole nation may really disappear. But in this case, the resistance is generally less lingering and the traditions of war vaguer. In a hilly or mountainous country, on the contrary, the invaders seldom succeed in doing more than driving the former possessors of the soil into their natural fastnesses; where,

5

10

1. The great civilized nations, which, from the absence of all earlier traditions, we vaguely name *indigenous*, are principally the Egyptians, the Indians, and the Chinese. What Strabo says of India might as truly be said of all,—that they have neither received nor sent out colonies; though Indians and Chinese emigrate largely as individuals. Masses so great have inevitably affected the barbarous tribes around them; yet their external influence has been small in proportion to their means. China has subdued Mongolia only by being subdued.

after long maintaining themselves in independence, nothing is commoner than that they should finally be blended with the victorious nation, and having
 15 adopted its manners, its religion, its tongue, should boast of its triumphs as their own, and moralize over the utter extirpation of the tribes whose lineal descendants they themselves are.

Many of these phenomena may be observed in the history of the Hebrew nation, whose origin was² referred to their great ancestor Abraham, a Chaldee
 20 by birth and language, and progenitor not only of Israel but of the Hagarenes and Edomites; while from Lot, his nephew and associate, were derived the contiguous nations of Ammon and Moab. But the history of the Israelites is distinguished from that of their neighbours by their early migration to Egypt and their eventful return; in the course of which an entirely new impress is
 25 supposed to have been left upon them under the agency of Moses, as the peculiar people of JEHOVAH. The tongue of Canaan or of Chaldea had been carried with them to Egypt; but in that country they were reduced to miserable bond-slaves, so mixed up with the Egyptian population, that even in birth their infants were liable to be murdered by their oppressors. If this account can be
 30 at all trusted, it is difficult to avoid the inference, that, like other slave populations, they lost their own language, and therefore brought back with them into Canaan the Egyptian tongue.³ Be this as it may, at any rate the invaders either kept or in course of time gained a Canaanitish speech, not untinged by Egyptian words. The other Canaanites named them *Hebrews*; a word which
 35 the Alexandrine translators of Genesis seem rightly to connect with the idea

2. I decline the task of discussing these genealogies minutely. They may be true: yet no stress is to be laid upon them, since from the nature of the case they cannot be *proved*. The details concerning Lot's incest are so evidently an invention of national enmity, as to throw some discredit on the rest of the genealogy.

3. This opinion is maintained by the Rev. Dr. Giles in his *Hebrew Records*, p. 173. The conclusion may be reasonably doubted by any who regard the tale of Hebrew bondage in Egypt to be much exaggerated in the details of the book of Exodus; yet to balance the probabilities is to me exceedingly hard.

19 [fn. added, 2nd ed.]

20-1 the Hagarites and Edomites; . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]

26 The tongue of Canaan had been . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]

27-38 to Egypt, and was brought back with but little change; so that they communicated with every nation of Canaan without an interpreter, and, in contrast to Egyptians, must have felt as in the midst of their own people. As their numbers . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]

32 [fn. added, 2nd ed.]

of being or coming *across a river*;⁴ nor is it unreasonable to believe that they first obtained this name, when their proper seat was conceived of by the Canaanites as on the east of Jordan. As their numbers were by no means such as to be able to occupy the country on both banks, they had no sooner obtained an adequate settlement in its various parts, than peaceful tendencies began to prevail over the aversion which religion excited in at least the principal leaders of Israel; and coalitions, which were generally reprobated by a distant posterity, arose between the armies of Jehovah and the families of Canaan. 40

The land over the fairest parts of which they had spread themselves, was critically situated in the ancient world, and had remarkable peculiarities of its own. It was the highway for armies between Egypt and all the great countries of Western Asia; a fact, the importance of which was not felt in the earlier stages of Hebrew history, but which, from the time that Assyria rose into power, mainly influenced the whole external destiny of the nation. The land itself is naturally very deficient in facilities for general communication, and in any well-marked frontier; and except when grasped in some more widely-spread dominion, it appears calculated to foster numerous small principalities or republics. The sea-coast on its western side runs nearly northward, though inclining to the east: two sets of highlands range north and south, between which is the valley of the river Jordan, a very remarkable depression. The streams run off from both sides of the western highlands, into the sea and into the Jordan, but are nowhere navigable nor of any magnitude. Nor did the coast afford many harbours able to accommodate even the little vessels of early navigation, until it reached the immediate neighbourhood of the Phœnicians, whose experience taught them beyond what point they must not covet its 50 55 60

4. Gen. xiv. 13, *the Hebrew* is rendered τὸν περάτην. The Hebrew and Arabic root "Eber, whence the name "Ebri (Hebrew) comes, means, *to cross* or *to be across a river*. In the later geography of Palestine the east bank of Jordan was called ἡ περαία, which significantly confirms the belief that the people of Moses, when settled on that district, were called for the same reason Hebrews by their western neighbours. Those who suppose *Abraham* to have been called a Hebrew, as the book of Genesis represents, must interpret the word of his have crossed *the Euphrates*: but this was not a present visible fact, to impress the people's imagination, and lead to a name. The Jewish notion that *Abraham* specifically was so called from his distant ancestor Heber, merely shows how indiscriminating in these matters is popular opinion.

[fn. added, 2nd ed.] 36
 to occupy the land, they . . . [rev. 2nd ed.] 39
 Jehovah and the sons and daughters of Canaan. [rev. 2nd ed.] 43

possession. The district theoretically assigned to the tribe of Asher⁵ runs north as far as Sidon, including Tyre with all its villages; but in fact neither Zebulon nor Asher seems ever to have possessed even the important city and harbour of Accho (*Ptolemaïs* or *Acre*), south of which, the bay of Accho, bounded by Carmel, belonged to Zebulon. Yet it is probable that the Tyrians did not grudge to them either the mainland or the havenless shore, but were satisfied to maintain themselves in fortified sea-ports, and keep up peaceful relations with the agricultural Asherites. The sea-coast allotted to Dan and Simeon, from Joppa southward, was yet to be conquered, though maritime Danites are once alluded to (Judges v. 17); so that with trifling exception the Israelitish nation was shut up on to the continent.

The Jordan, which gives to Canaan so peculiar a character, might have seemed the natural centre of the whole country; since the warmth and fertility of its well-watered basin, and the ease of keeping up communication along it, appear to award its possession to a single power, and to give to that power large home-resources. But in fact it rather separated than united the children of Israel. The tribes to whom its eastern side was conceded found the open highlands very favourable to pasturage; and having brought with them out of Egypt the habits of shepherds, would not renounce that independent, roving, and marauding life to become laborious tillers of fertile plains, whose crops must always be exposed to the inroads of their pastoral neighbours. A sharp line of division, which affected the whole subsequent history, was thus drawn between the western agriculturists and the eastern or grazier tribes of Israel. These were, the Reubenites on the south; the Gadites above them; and, still farther to the north, the half-tribe of Manasseh, which, though warlike and adventurous, seldom took any eager interest in the welfare of Israel at large. Our narratives ascribe their easy and complete possession of their land to the fact that Israel entered Canaan from that side, and by united force conquered Sihon king of Heshbon, and Og king of Bashan. Indeed, from a knowledge of the later history alone, a speculator might imagine that all Israel had resided or roved for some generations on the land of the eastern tribes; and when their numbers increased, had gradually crossed the Jordan in parties, with far inferior force to that which had overrun the eastern shore.

5. The words in Gen. xlix. 13 greatly need elucidation: "*Zebulon shall be a haven for ships, and his border shall be unto Zidon.*" It is said that "Zidon" means Phœnicia; but if this is admissible, the words still are far more appropriate to Asher.

72-3 to be conquered, and was theirs only in intention; so that . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]
 88 still more to the north, . . . [rev. 3rd ed.]
 95 tribes; and that when . . . [rev. 3rd ed.]

imparts to their psalms a majesty peculiar to themselves, and no small portion of poetical beauty.

1. Lord, thou has been our refuge in every generation. 270
 Ere ever the mountains were born,
 Ere thou hadst rounded the earth and world,
 From ages to ages thou art God.
2. Thou turnest mortals to the dust;
 Again, thou callest back the children of Adam. 275
 For a thousand years, in thy sight,
 Are but as yesterday when it vanishes,
 And as a watch in the night.
 Thou sweepest them away, and they are as a dream,
 Or as the grass in the morning, which grows afresh.⁶ 280
 In the morning it flourishes and grows afresh,
 In the evening it fades and withers.
3. For we are consumed by thy anger,
 And by thy wrath we are afflicted. 285
 Thou hast set our sins before thy eyes,
 And all our secrets in the light of thy countenance.
 In thy displeasure all our days vanish,
 And, *swift* as thought, we bring our years to nothing.
4. Our days of life are seventy years,
 Or by reason of strength, eighty years: 290
 Yet is their pride but labour and sorrow;
 It hastens over, and we fly away.
 Who knoweth the might of thy anger?
 As are thy terrors, such is thy displeasure.
 Our days therefore teach us to number, 295
 That we may attain a wise heart.
5. Return, O Jehovah! how long first?
 And take pity on thy servants. 300
 Early with thy mercy satisfy us,
 That all our life we may joy and be glad.
 Gladden us as many days as thou hast bowed us down,
 As many years as we have seen adversity.
 Show to thy servants thy deeds,
 And to their children thy glory!
 And let the grace of Jehovah our God be upon us, 305
 And the work of our hands, establish thou it,
 The work of our hands, establish thou it.

6. We have here followed Winer's Simonis and our current English Version, in preference to De Wette and Ewald.

Yet it must not be supposed that the poetry of that day was confined to these solemn and contemplative subjects. Israel lived in the midst of poetical nations, and from the earliest times must have been accustomed to hear from Canaanites and Amorites songs of no mean beauty, well-fitted to cultivate several species of composition. Israelitish war-songs arose at a very early period. As one very ancient specimen, we may here produce the song of triumph which celebrated the conquest of the plains of Moab by Israel from Sihon, king of Heshbon, who had himself taken them from the Moabites (Num. xxi. 27).

1. Come into Heshbon!
Built and fortified be Sihon's city!
For out of Heshbon a fire is gone,
A flame out of Sihon's city,
Which has devoured Ar of Moab,
And the dwellers of the heights of Arnon.
2. Woe to thee, Moab!
Thou are undone, people of Chemosh!
He⁷ has made his sons to be runaways,
And his daughters captives to the Amorite king, Sihon.
3. We have shot at them!
Heshbon is perished, even unto Dibon.
We have laid them waste even unto Nophah;
There is fire as far as Medeba.

The satirical congratulation of Sihon and pity over Moab give a grand irony to the short and energetic conclusion, which in its very abruptness characterizes the unartificial and primitive style.

Nevertheless, the Hebrew prophets were not free from various tinges of fanaticism, which generated also affectation. That they often worked themselves into a religious frenzy (as in the wild Asiatic ceremonies which the Greeks called *Orgies*), may be inferred from the same verb in Hebrew⁸ meaning "to prophesy" and "to be mad." The extravagance ascribed to Saul, that in prophesying he stripped off his clothes before Samuel, and lay down bare of raiment all day and all night,—whatever doubt may rest on the narrative from

7. He,—the god Chemosh.

8. Euripides (Bacc. 299) says: "Frenzy has in it much divination;" a sentence which seems allusive to the Greek idea that *mantis* (diviner) is derived from *mania* (frenzy).

337 [fn. 8:] So Plato derives μάντις (a diviner) from μάλνεσθαι (to be mad). [rev. 3rd ed.]

339-40 lay down naked all day . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]

its being a duplicate of a similar story,—must have been borrowed from the manners of the age, and is mentioned without surprise or censure. Even later prophets are recorded to have walked naked⁹ and barefoot, or to have lain upon one side sometimes for years, like the religious madmen of the East; and some proceedings yet more ambiguous are ascribed to them.¹⁰ The habit of wearing a single coarse garment originally perhaps arose from real indigence; but it gradually grew into an affectation, like the austere dress of monks and friars; and in the later times of the monarchy, men who are stigmatized as “false prophets” are accused of assuming for unworthy ends the sanctified exterior of poverty. In fact, even concerning those who are regarded as true prophets we hear occasionally of fanatical acts, which are not without analogy to the practice of the priests of Baal, who cut themselves with knives to assist in prophesying. For instance (1 Kings xx. 35, etc.), a prophet orders a man to wound him, and pronounces a solemn curse on him because he refuses; and having induced another to obey, goes thus wounded to address the king of Israel. It might even seem (from Zech. xiii. 4-6), that wounds inflicted on the hands were, equally with the rough garment, an ordinary emblem of the prophet.

So strong was the tendency of the vulgar to seek to prophets rather for a knowledge of the future than for religious instruction, that it was scarcely possible to get rid of Divination in all its forms; which nevertheless the prophets endeavoured to reduce to those few which had most moral dignity.

9. I have been censured for using the word *naked*. I am told it means, “without one’s jacket,” as John xxi. 7. I have but innocently followed the received English version, and do not pretend to know exactly what it means, except that to the Hebrews themselves it appeared unseemly and more than undignified. My immediate allusion was to Isaiah xx. 2-4, where it says: “Loose the sackcloth from off *thy loins*” (which, I confess, suggests to me nakedness of the most shameful kind), and adds: “naked and barefoot, with *buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt*.” So in 2 Sam. vi. 20, Michal remonstrating with David on his religious dancing, complains that he “uncovered himself in the eyes of the handmaids, as one of the *vain fellows shamelessly uncovereth himself*.” I do not know how these expressions affect other minds. To me it is truly hard to imagine, that they imply no more than stripping the upper part of the body as a workman to relieve heat.

10. Many commentators have wished to explain such deeds as done *only in vision*, but their sole argument seems to be, that we ought not to believe anything so outrageous of those holy men as the literal interpretation states. Yet this appears to be hardly an adequate ground for rejecting a plain assertion, which does not in itself suggest that the transactions are visionary.

Against the various modes of enchantment and necromancy, to which the neighbouring religions were addicted, they protested vehemently, as against a concealed idolatry. To consult the spirit of a dead man, or to watch the flight of birds, was at best to seek to the creature instead of the Creator; and led to an indiscriminate adoption of other foreign superstitions. But they did not treat with the same severity all desire to penetrate into the secrets of futurity, provided that the Being consulted was none but Jehovah himself. We hear of four principal modes in which Jehovah was supposed to give responses (1 Sam. x. 20; xxviii. 6)—*by dreams, by Urim, by lot, and by prophecy*. (1.) It has always been a specious and favourite idea that the human soul during sleep passes into closer contact with the world of spirits, and is better fitted than in waking hours for receiving divine communications. Nice distinctions indeed were drawn between *dreams* and *visions* by most early nations, but it is manifest that they can have had no very trustworthy criterion for judging to which of the two classes a particular appearance belonged. The learned Jews in later times have with one voice declared, that the highest species of prophecy was that, in which the divine spirit influenced the soul without throwing it into sleep or impairing its natural energies: nevertheless, visions seen in sleep were always recognized as one undoubted mode in which Jehovah made known his will and laid open the future; and though it is probable that divine dreams were not regarded as confined to prophets, yet none were so eminent in this sort of revelation as they. (2.) *Urim* and *Thummim* was the name of a peculiar breastplate of precious stones worn by the High Priest, and employed by him to ask counsel of Jehovah. The imperfect explanation given of this apparatus in the Hebrew books, is in part cleared up by a collateral ornament employed by the Egyptians. We know from Diodorus (i. 48, 75), that the Chief Judge of Egypt carried on his breast an image symbolic of TRUTH, with its eyes shut,¹¹ formed of precious stones, and hung from his neck by a golden chain. The stones are said by Ælian¹² to be of *sapphire*. As the words *Urim* and *Thummim* are rendered by the Alexandrian translators Δήλωσις καὶ Αλήθεια, Manifestation and Truth, and indeed the Egyptian word is *Thmei*, we cannot overlook the similarity. According to the learned

11. See Gen. xli. 42. This appears to be the original of *Justice* with her eyes bandaged; but the Hebrew conception may rather be, that the priest saw more distinctly with the inward eye, when his bodily eye was closed. (Compare Num. xxiv. 4).

12. Schweighaeuser in loco Diodori. The root *Thumm* is Hebrew and Arabic. Egyptian *Thmei* suggests also Greek Θέμις, Justice.

391 [fn. 12: "The root . . . Justice" added, 2nd ed.]

394 *Thmei* (Greek Θέμις, the Goddess of Truth and Justice), we . . . [rev. 3rd ed.]

Alexandrian Jew Philo, the sacred breastplate of the Hebrews contained 395
 “images of the two virtues (or powers);” which he is likely to have inferred in
 part from Egyptian analogies: but how it was used to obtain omens, we are
 wholly ignorant. Two things may be alleged concerning this method. First,
 that the prophets felt no jealousy whatever against it, as in the slightest degree
 compromising the honour of Jehovah, who was professionally consulted by 400
 it. Secondly, that it cannot have been free from a large admixture of that, which
 we (surveying it from a higher point of view) are forced to regard as Superstition.
 The priest, when seeking for an oracle, first put on the sacred tippet, called
 the Ephod; then looked to the twelve precious stones which he wore on his
 breast; and according to Josephus, found in the brilliancy of some of them 405
 an intelligible omen. (3.) The *lot* is recorded to have been used on many solemn
 occasions; and down to the latest times of the existence of Israel it was firmly
 believed that God made replies by means of it. (4.) Finally, the people resorted
 to the prophet, not merely as a moral teacher, but as a soothsayer, who would
 tell them of goods lost or stolen, and other convenient matters; and from this 410
 lower point of view (as it would seem) they called him a *seer* rather than a
prophet.¹³ In the times preceding Samuel the prophetic spirit had put forth
 so little influence on the nation, that the prevailing tendency with the ignorant
 was to view Samuel himself as only a *seer*; and whatever degree of historical 415
 weight we attach to the events connected with Saul’s looking after the asses
 of Kish, it is clear that the story could not have originated, if it had not been
 a familiar belief that the seers were useful persons to consult on such affairs.
 From this time forth however they were gradually to assume a higher national
 importance. Their advice was asked on topics of great public moment, nor did
 they refuse it; but their mode of seeking for a divine reply was not ceremonial 420
 or superstitious, however tinged with a high enthusiasm. The prophet either
 played on the lyre himself or (to judge by one distant example) called for a
 minstrel to do so, and wrapt himself in pious meditation on the subject of
 inquiry; until, gaining an insight into its moral bearings and kindled by the
 melody, he delivered a response in high-wrought and generally poetical strain. 425

Such is the best general idea which we can get of the position and agency
 of those prophets, who from Samuel downwards imparted to the history of
 Israel nearly all its peculiarity and all its value. Samuel himself indeed is more

13. Yet a *seer* is a man who has *visions*, like Ezekiel: thus in contrast to Nathan the prophet we have Gad the seer and Iddo the seer (who saw visions against Jeroboam), 2 Chron. ix. 29.

After this, we enter on a new period of uncertainty; that of David's persecution by Saul. The only account which we have is in many respects questionable;²⁸ if however we try to gather up the trustworthy points, we may

905

Indians and *skulls* of many savage tribes. It seems to indicate the intensity of national feeling, with which this war of independence was prosecuted by the Israelites. At the same time, it is a pretty good proof that the Philistines were the *only* uncircumcised nation in those parts; else the test would have been delusive.

28. Three separate attempts to assassinate David while sitting at table are ascribed to Saul, in nearly the same words (ch. xviii. 11; xix. 10), as if a man whose life had been thus sought, would so expose himself again. The attempt in ch. xviii. is so manifestly premature and a duplicate account, that it has been freely expunged by the Vatican LXX. Notwithstanding this, and other more inveterate efforts to arrest David's person (xix. 11, 20, 21), Jonathan is immediately after wholly incredulous that his father has any evil designs against David (xx. 3); and Saul is surprised to find that David does not occupy his usual place at the new moon (v. 26, 27). Finally, Jonathan *first* discovers his father's deadly intentions, by the latter hurling his javelin at David's empty seat (v. 33). Not only does this imply no overt attack on David's life to have been previously made; but we have here a probable indication, that the story of the thrice-attempted assassination is a mere exaggeration of the last-named display of malice. Various *duplicate* accounts also occur in this portion of the narrative. A new version is given us of the story of Saul's prophesying, which, it is said, gave rise to the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" (Contrast 1 Sam. x. 12, with xix. 24.) Since both of these accounts cannot assign the correct origin of the proverb, it is possible that neither may. Another credible source of it is exhibited inadvertently in 1 Sam. xviii. 10, where Saul, when enraged against David, is said (in the English version) to have "*prophesied* in the midst of the house." Beyond a doubt the Hebrew word here means *he raved*; but as in later times this sense was almost unknown, the idea of Saul's "prophesying" may have risen out of some misunderstanding on the subject. A double and inconsistent account is found of David's abode at the court of Achish king of Gath (xxi. 10-15, and xxvii.), of which the former seems to be wrong in chronology. Twice also it is told how David

[*paragraph from the 1st ed., omitted in the 2nd and 3rd eds.:*]

904-5

The general outline here given is doubtless historical; but all experience shows the slaughter of 200 Philistines to be a fable. It is not pretended to be a miracle. The bravest men, most inveterately devoted to war, when matched against enemies equally well-armed, can never achieve such feats, nor anything to compare to them, though similar incidents abound in poetry and romance. We have however trust to the main fact, that Michal was really given to the youthful hero, who now took his place on stated days at the king's table, and had multiplied opportunities of forming acquaintance, and winning confidence, with the most important persons in the land.

[*fn. 28: (1st sentence:)* a man whose life had once been sought . . . (*9th sentence, above:)* Another possible source of it. . . (*end sentence, following page:)* very partially efficient; . . . (*all revisions, 2nd ed.*)]

907

perhaps find the following to be historical. Michal suspected that Saul harboured evil designs, and warned her husband (xix. 11) not to trust himself to Saul's messengers, when they came with peaceful pretensions; upon which
 910 David withdrew into retirement, and possibly sought the counsel of Samuel and other prophets. Jonathan however could not be persuaded that there was any danger, and besought David to return to court; which the latter refused. When Saul inquired why David was not in his seat at table on the first and
 915 second day of the new moon, Jonathan pretended that he was accidentally absent in consequence of a feast at Bethlehem; at which Saul, whose conscience told him that this was not the true reason, was so enraged as to dart his javelin at the empty seat. The truth was now manifest to Jonathan, who sent word to David to beware. The latter had already for some time had a peculiar
 920 body-guard,—those perhaps who were chiefly round his person in battle, as he was both a general and the king's son-in-law: with these he proceeded hastily to Ahimelech,²⁹ the chief priest, at Nôb, on his way to the strongholds of the hill-country of Judah, where the authority of Saul was weak, and the border tribes within easy reach. His first care was to carry his parents over into the
 925 Moabite country, and commit them to the good faith of the Moabite king,

spared Saul's life under circumstances peculiarly romantic and unlikely to recur (xxiv. and xxvi.). Each event is preceded by an attempt of the men of Ziph to betray David; each is followed by a solemn reconciliation; and in the former, David makes oath by Jehovah that when he shall become king he will not cut off the seed of Saul (xxiv. 21, 22); an oath wholly unknown to a writer of a later part of the history (2 Sam. xxi. 7-9). Strange to say, the latter reconciliation and the solemn blessing of Saul on David (xxvi. 25) does but make David despair of safety and determine to leave the land of Israel entirely (xxvii. 1); so disjointed is the whole account. Immediately after his first flight from Saul, David is described as betaking himself to Samuel at Ramah; whereupon Samuel and he leave Ramah and take up their dwelling at Naioth. The narrative then states (xix. 18-24) that Saul's messengers and Saul himself were thrice miraculously foiled in an attempt to seize David there. Nevertheless, the miracles appear to have been very partially effectual; for David instantly leaves Naioth as if insecure.

29. Our account states that none of his men were armed; which excited the surprise of Ahimelech; and that David was glad to borrow for himself the sword of Goliath. Why or how this should be, is not explained. We may at any rate infer that Ahimelech had been previously used to see him attended by an armed guard.

About this time it is credible that David composed the 11th Psalm, as applicable to his forlorn state. It seems to be his earliest extant composition, and gives a beautiful view of his resigned self-possession.

914 When Samuel inquired why David . . . [*only in the 2nd ed.*]

918 was now manifested to . . . [*rev. 3rd ed.*]

922 [*fn. 29: (2nd line:) and that he was glad . . . (rev. 2nd ed.)*]

whose people seems for a long time to have kept up a friendly connexion with Israel. That he did not stay in Moab himself may show that from this moment he had determined, if not to contest the kingdom with Saul (which his friendship with Jonathan forbid), yet to measure force against him and reduce him to some secure conditions of peace. Yet it is also credible that the king of Moab may have feared to involve his people in war by protecting David himself. Be this as it may, David now undisguisedly assumed the character of a freebooter, and invited all to join him who could strengthen his little army. According to the narrative in 1 Sam. xxvi., Abishai, son of David's sister, and probably Joab, his brother, came at this time of distress to David's side, if indeed they were not previously in his body-guard. Moreover, "every one who was in distress, or in debt, or discontented," flocked around him; and he had soon a band of 400 men, which gradually swelled into 600. He employed them in protecting the cattle on the wild and open country from the hostilities of marauding neighbours—Amalekites, Hittites, Jebusites, and others; and as his reward, received tributes of food and other necessaries from the sheep-masters, which were generally paid with good will, but when otherwise, were summarily enforced (xxv. 34). 930 935 940

Meanwhile, Saul regarded him as no longer a domestic rival, but as a robber and public enemy; and proceeded to treat all who harboured him as traitors. His first dreadful wrath fell upon Nôb, where Ahimelech had given provisions to David's retinue, using the sacred *show-bread* for this purpose. Nôb, at a very short distance to the north of Jerusalem, was at this time the chief town of the priests, where the customary ceremonies to Jehovah went on day by day, in spite of the absence of both ark and tabernacle.³⁰ In Nôb the head of the house of Eli enjoyed the priestly veneration which Samuel had not sought to appropriate; and by the public liberality directed to this centre of worship, a large number of priestly families were enabled to live together. Saul now resolved to terrify all from the cause of David by a tremendous example, and ordered a general massacre, not of the priests only, but of every living thing within the town. No true-born Israelite could be found to obey; one man only (as our account declares), Doeg the Edomite, executed the atrocious command; and slew in that day eighty-five "persons who wore a linen ephod," besides "all the men and women, children and sucklings, oxen, asses, and sheep," in the town of Nôb. 945 950 955 960

30. The ark seems to have remained at Kirjathjearim, with the family of Abinadab, "who dwelt on the hill." The ridge ended in the greater elevation of *Gibeon*, where also was the tabernacle and the high altar of burnt-offering.

This statement seems to need comment. Taken to the letter, it is physically impossible that one man can have perpetrated such carnage; although he might certainly have slain eighty-five priests in chains, if the Israelites had so far obeyed the king as to chain them. We have already seen in the case of the Amalekites a credulous exaggeration of massacre; and there is nothing in the whole book with justifies us in supposing that Doeg was leader of a *band* of Edomites serving under the king, whose united force might have been used. Here, as elsewhere, a monarch who was cut off in unsuccessful battle, and whose dynasty fell with him,—mainly through his own follies and crime,—has probably had still more imputed to him than the reality. Yet we cannot doubt that at this time he slew Ahimelech and many other leading men among the priests; under the idea that by this vigorous policy—(for so worldly-minded and short-sighted statesmen often denominate cruelty)—he would cut off all support from David. Nor did Saul’s anger stay here. By a later allusion we find that “he slew the Gibeonites;” which must have been a continuation of his feud against the priests. The Gibeonites intended are not the inhabitants of Gibeon in general, but a class of inferior ministers of the high altar at Gibeon, whose duty was to supply water and firewood for religious services. At present the tabernacle also was at Gibeon; and we may conjecture that the priestly families there showed some sympathy with their brethren of Nôb, sufficient to offend the king, who could no longer stop at half-measures. Whether he slew any priests at Gibeon, as well as the “hewers of wood and drawers of water,” is uncertain. But the murder of the latter is specially commemorated, because they were a kind of sacred slaves, whose lives were guaranteed, as tradition told, by the oath of Joshua; when, being Hivites, they had surrendered themselves, though with fraudulent concealment that they belonged to that nation. This remarkable story may seem to show that the high altar had been at Gibeon from the time of Joshua, though the tabernacle was then placed at Shiloh.

But Saul’s cruelty produced the very reverse of what he intended. The priestly body over the whole land was made inveterately hostile, and began to look out for security and revenge; moreover, Abiathar son of Ahimelech fled to David, and instantly gave a new colour to his position. With the representative of Eli in his camp, who wore a high priest’s ephod and consulted Jehovah by Urim, David now appeared as the champion of the priests in a sacred war of vengeance.

Upon this the king looked on the rebellion as sufficiently important to need his personal presence with an armed force; and having marched out with

982 slew the priests [rev. 2nd ed.]

become a more important person than Joab; and his force now obtained the empire for Solomon. Bathsheba first broke to David the unpleasant secret, and with the help of Nathan induced him to take immediate measures for securing the succession of the throne. Benaiah marched hastily with his guards and surprised Adonijah while yet at the banquet. The guests were dispersed, and Solomon was proclaimed king. No immediate notice was taken of the chief actors in this conspiracy. Solomon indeed publicly pardoned his brother Adonijah for the past; nevertheless it is certain that, together with Joab and Abiathar, he was from that day devoted to ruin.

Soon after these events the strength of David sank rapidly. With his last breath he charged Solomon to remember gratefully the services of old Barzillai the Gileadite, and admit his sons to the royal table; but to find some pretext for putting to death Joab son of Zeruiah, and Shimei the Benjamite, whom, some ten years before, he had ostentatiously pardoned for cursing him. So at least our record states; but it is very credible that David was more sincere in his forgiveness, and that his charge to Solomon against these two persons is no more true than the charge of Augustus to Tiberius Cæsar to put to death his daughter and her son. The despot who slays for his own policy shifts the crime on to the memory of his predecessor.

David, the son of Jesse, after a reign of forty years, closed his eyes to all mortal ambition, and slept with his fathers. Of him we may say, as of some other very eminent persons, it would have been well had he died before absolute power had corrupted him. The complicated baseness involved in his murder of Uriah so casts his honour in the dust, that thenceforth we rather pity and excuse than admire him. All the brilliancy alike of his chivalry and of his piety is sullied, and cold minds suspect his religious raptures of hypocrisy. But we

[paragraph ends:] So at least our record states. *[added to the 2nd ed.:*] but it is very credible . . . his predecessor.

Upon this, David, . . . *[rev. 2nd ed.]* 1137

hypocrisy. If Nathan had been wise and bold enough to slash open the monarch's conscience, before the wen of wickedness had swelled into a carbuncle, most happy might it have been; but we cannot wonder that it was so very hard to rebuke a despotic and victorious prince. *[rev. 2nd ed., replacing "wise and bold enough" with "able," and "rebuke" with "curb"; rev. 3rd ed. to its present form.]* 1143-4

raptures of hypocrisy.* *[fn. added to the 2nd ed., omitted in the 3rd ed.:]* 1143

*The *second* of my North British Reviewers (No. 35, p. 151) cannot bear that I should discriminate men's good and evil. "The ribaldry of Paine," says this writer, "itself is a relief, logically speaking, compared with this combination of *kissing and smiting under the fifth rib.*" And p. 150, "Every eulogy [in Mr. Newman] has some reservation; *every compliment some sting in its tail.* Of David we are told that *all the*

cannot wonder at sins of passion in a despotic and victorious prince. David
 1145 was not indeed an Antoninus, an Alfred, or a Saint Louis; yet neither was he
 one of the vulgar herd of kings. The polygamy in which he indulged so injuri-
 ously must in part be laid to his personal weakness, when we observe how
 restrained (in comparison) was his predecessor Saul.⁶⁴ Nevertheless, as a man,
 he was affectionate and generous, sympathetic and constitutionally pious: as
 1150 a king, his patronage of religious persons was highly judicious, and his whole
 devotional character of permanent importance to the best interests of his
 people and of mankind; as a warrior, he taught Israel a mutual confidence and
 common pride in Jehovah their God; and first elevated his countrymen into
 1155 a ruling and leading race, whose high place it was to legislate for and teach the
 heathen around. His career may serve to warn all who are wanting in depth of
 passion or enlarged knowledge of human nature, that those on whose conduct
 society has relaxed its wholesome grasp are not to be judged of by their partial
 outbreaks of evil, but by the amount of positive good which they habitually
 exhibit. Compared with the great statesmen of the educated nations of Europe,
 1160 David's virtues and vices appear alike puerile; but among Asiatics he was a
 great man; and of his own posterity, though several, who were happily subject-
 ed to greater restraints, were far more consistent in goodness, there is none
 who more attracts our interest and our love than the heroic and royal Psalmist.

64. Saul, as far as we know, had only one wife and one concubine, Rizpah; and it is quite possible that the wife was removed by death before the concubine was espoused, since Rizpah's children are named in company with their nephews, as if much younger than Saul's legitimate sons. A concubine, in ancient times, was only a wife of *inferior rank*, and the union was just as permanent as with a wife.

brilliancy alike of his chivalry and of his piety is sullied, and cold minds suspect his religious raptures of hypocrisy. The prophets, from Joel to Isaiah, are only lauded *at the expense of their successors.*" I previously knew much of the bigotry of the so-called Evangelical School, but I also knew much of their virtues; and I did not expect that any one would malign me for dropping a word of reprobation on the great crime of David. I fully believe that most readers of that review will think the writer regards me as *hypocritical*: for how can he call it "kissing and smiting under the fifth rib," to praise sincerely, and dispraise conscientiously? But this writer has assured me (what he declines to inform his readers, otherwise than by the phrase *logically speaking*), that it is not his *moral* but his *logical* sense which is offended, that I can so absurdly mingle praise and blame? If he had said this intelligibly to the public, I should not fear that any readers would think the worse of my consistency or shudder with him at my preposterous logic. But he has chosen to write, in language of moral inflammation, that ninety-nine readers out of a hundred will believe that he is charging me with patronizing lies, sympathizing with imposture, and acting the impostor myself.

1160-1 he was a truly great man; . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]

CHAPTER IV. REIGN OF SOLOMON.

SAUL and David had each of them been installed in the throne of Israel by the solemn act of the elders, as kings accepted by the free voice of the nation, and bound to respect its liberties. But Solomon was elevated to the supreme authority by his father's will and by the aid of the irresistible body-guard;¹ not indeed without the sanction of Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet; yet the helplessness of Abiathar, the elder priest and the representative of Eli, showed clearly enough that the swords of Benaiah were now the decisive influence. Israel in fact had for years been accustomed to address David with unmanly servility; and although the old king's popularity had been thoroughly worn out, the nation was ready to welcome his youthful son with a credulous loyalty. In young princes, as yet uncorrupted by power, and guiltless of the deeds by which it was won, the common people enthusiastically believe a superhuman virtue to exist; and as the administration passed into Solomon's hands before death surprised his aged father, the new reign commenced without any shock or felt internal jar.

1. The Chronicler not merely passes over the conspiracy of Adonijah, and the prompt military proceedings of David by which Solomon was made king, but introduces an account intended to glorify the constitutional decorum and religious spirit of the whole proceeding (1 Chr. xxviii. xxix). David (says he) assembled all the princes of the nation, civil and military, and told them of the earnest desire which he had felt to build a temple to Jehovah; but *Jehovah* had forbidden him, as having been a warrior, but *had now chosen his son Solomon to succeed him* and build the temple. David then delivers to Solomon an exact "pattern" of the temple and all its furniture, with all the materials of precious or common metals, precious stones and marble, and requests the princes to contribute to the same sacred object. Of course they contribute with a zeal very edifying to the people of Nehemiah. Then follows a thanksgiving by David,

[fn. 1: line 14, "1000 rams" added; lines 19-21, sentence "The Chronicler . . . succession." added; end line:] 1 Chr. xviii. 16, as if to imply that Abiathar was dead, and that Zadok came to the primacy by the superiority of his age to that of Abimelech. [rev. 2nd ed.]

There appears nevertheless to have been some commotion among the foreign nations now subject to the Hebrew sway. They might naturally expect feebleness in a young king who had never headed an army, and they may have reckoned on some internal disorders to aid them. Our accounts of this reign are too defective as to all foreign affairs to allow of appeal to historical details; but an echo has been preserved to us of certain attempts to throw off the yoke, in a celebrated psalm (Ps. ii.) composed in honour of Solomon's empire by a prophet of the day, who seems to put the words into the mouth of Solomon himself.

- 20
- 25 1. Why rage the peoples? and why do the nations plan things vain?
 Why assemble the kings of earth, why plot together the rulers,
 Against Jehovah and his anointed one?
 Saying, "Let us break their bands asunder,
 Let us cast their cords away from us."
- 30 2. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh,
 Jehovah shall mock at them.
 Then he shall say unto them in his wrath,
 (And vex them in his sore displeasure.)
 "Behold! I have set up my king,
 35 On Zion, my hill of holiness."
3. I² will rehearse the decree which Jehovah hath uttered to me:
 Jehovah hath said unto me: "Thou art my Son;
 This day have I begotten thee.
 Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thy inheritance,
 40 The uttermost parts of earth for thy possession.

of such eminent beauty, that for the sake of it we can almost pardon the fabulous history in which it has been imbedded. Afterwards is a sacrifice of 1000 bullocks, 1000 rams, and 1000 lambs, preparatory to the final object of the whole meeting, *the free election of Solomon by the assembly to be king*, in confirmation of his election by Jehovah. The untrustworthiness of the whole is strongly marked in its last words—that the congregation simultaneously *elected Zadok to be priest*. This is directly opposed to the book of Kings. Abiathar continued to be the priest until after the death of Adonijah. The Chronicler did not like to confess that Zadok was indebted for his sacred pre-eminence to the mere will of a despotic prince, who broke the hierarchical succession. In the Chronicles, not only is the disgrace of Abiathar omitted, but no notice of him occurs in the history except the formal statement that "Abimelech son of Abiathar" was colleague of Zadok, 1 Chr. xviii. 16, which is an error reproduced from 2 Sam. viii. 17.

2. I, Solomon.

Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron;
 Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potsherd.”

4. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings;
 Be instructed, ye judges of earth.
 Serve Jehovah with fear; 45
 Rejoice with trembling.
 Worship in purity,³ lest he be angry,
 And ye perish straightway, should his wrath be a little kindled.
5. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.

Whatever disturbances were threatened among Philistines, Moabites, 50
 or Damascenes, were presently quelled with no serious effort by the unim-
 paired vigour of David’s armies; and as far as can be ascertained, no farther
 attempt was made to shake off the yoke until the later days of Solomon. The
 young prince was therefore fully at leisure to devote himself to his internal 55
 affairs, and first of all to that first object of interest, the secure establishment
 of his own title to the crown against all competitors.

Four great political offenders had been ostensibly, but not sincerely, par-
 doned:—Adonijah brother of Solomon, Joab the king’s first cousin, Abiathar 60
 the priest, and Shimei the kinsman of Saul who cursed David. The ruin of all
 four was resolved upon, and Solomon was only waiting for a specious pre-
 tence. Nor was one long wanting. David in extreme old age had received into his
 harem, by the superfluous zeal of his courtiers, a young damsel of remarkable 65
 beauty, Abishag the Shunamite. If it be true that they sought far and wide, and
 picked her out of all Israel, it cannot be wonderful that her brilliancy attracted
 the love of Adonijah; who engaged the interest of Bathsheba, mother of Solo- 70
 mon, to make his suit to the king for the hand of Abishag. But no sooner had
 the unsuspecting Bathsheba preferred her request, than the king felt or affected
 great rage, alleging that this was a plot for dethroning him; and forthwith sent
 Benaiah with his myrmidons, who murdered the king’s brother on the spot
 where they found him.

So flagrant an act of despotism had not been seen in Israel since Doeg 75
 the Edomite massacred the priests at Saul’s command. It was at least politic
 of Solomon to follow up the deed by commanding the death of Joab as a part-
 ner in the imagined new conspiracy. Joab fled to “the tabernacle of Jehovah”
 (which here perhaps means the tent in Jerusalem, in which the ark was kept),

3. This word in good Hebrew cannot mean *a Son*. The LXX. renders the clause
 Δράξασθε παιδείας, “lay hold of instruction.” We have nearly followed Ewald.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV.

On the Chronology.

THERE is no difference of opinion among chronologers, that the date of the capture of Samaria by Shalmaneser is B.C. 721; but when we reckon the times backward from this, various inconsistencies are discovered. It is not requisite here to reiterate what has been so often treated. What we have particularly
 5 to remark is, that after making the corrections which are usually approved, two great gaps still remain in the Israelitish history, which have been called *Interregnums*; the one of ten years, between the death of Jeroboam II. and the accession of his son Zachariah: the other of nine years, between the death of Pekah and the accession of his murderer Hoshea. In the text we read simply,
 10 "Jeroboam slept with his fathers, and Zachariah his son reigned in his stead:"⁴⁵ and "Hoshea slew Pekah and reigned in his stead, in the twentieth year of Jotham son of Uzziah."⁴⁶ It is manifest that the compiler had in neither case the remotest idea of an interregnum, and we therefore ought not to interpolate so serious an event merely in deference to figures, which are easily corrupted,
 15 and often in these books undeniably faulty.

Hitzig has rightly remarked, that the second interregnum vanishes, if we properly interpret the reign of Jotham, who began to exercise royal power before his father died. Yet when we have no new facts for Pekah's reign, it is hard to approve of lengthening it by eight years, which indeed involves more
 20 alterations than are enough. It suffices instead to correct the age of Hezekiah⁴⁷ by deducting ten years; by which indeed we make Ahaz twenty or twenty-one years older than his son, while Hitzig computes nineteen only. In the common chronology there is but ten or eleven years between them, which is obviously absurd. Accordingly in the following pages, we follow a reckoning
 25 which reduces the dates of Uzziah, Pekah, and his near predecessors, by nine or ten years, which is the imaginary interregnum between Pekah and Hoshea.

As for the other gap, we have to choose between lengthening by ten years the reign of some Israelitish king, or shortening by a like sum that of a king of Judah. If the former plan be approved, we find one reason for lengthening
 30 that of Jeroboam; namely, that one correction then suffices: for the number 27 in 2 Kings xv. 1, must on other grounds necessarily be altered, and is not

45. Kings xiv. 29.

46. Kings xv. 30.

47. Chap. xviii. 2.

here to be reckoned. Yet as Jeroboam has already a reign of forty-one years, we shrink from increasing it to fifty-one; a length of time which, though possible, ought hardly to be obtruded by conjectural emendation. Instead of this, to lengthen the reign of Menahem from above, though we have then three alterations to make in xv. 13, 17,—might still be better than the former change. 35

If we follow the general belief, that the same Hosea who composed the last eleven chapters of the book which bears his name, wrote the first chapter in the reign of Jeroboam II., we can scarcely doubt that the received chronology is in this part much too long; for as his last chapters date from the *siege of Samaria*, it assigns to him full sixty years of prophesying. Isaiah and Micah also were believed by the ancient compilers of their works to have written under four successive kings of Judah, which is another hint to us that they held a shorter chronology. On the whole, then, we see reasons for preferring the alternative of deducting ten years from some Jewish reign. 40 45

When we endeavour to pick out the particular reign, we find that there is danger of lowering too much the excess of age of father over son. On this ground, Amaziah and Uzziah are the only two reigns to be thought of, unless we choose to encounter the need of several other changes. Their ages exceed those of their sons by thirty-eight and forty-three years respectively. Yet we cannot thus deal with Uzziah (whose accession we have already lowered by nine or ten years) without making Jotham die before his father. It remains therefore to deduct ten years from Amaziah's reign,⁴⁸ and to suppose that he was only twenty-eight older than his son Uzziah. From these changes we finally bring out that the death of Solomon was in the year B.C. 955. 50 55

The reigns of Solomon, of David, and (according to St. Paul in the Acts of the Apostles) of Saul likewise, are forty years each. This does not appear too long a period in itself, either for Solomon or for David; yet the number has so many mythical associations as to lessen our confidence in its having historical foundation. 60

A chronological table may here be suitably added.

48. For this we must change twenty-nine into nineteen in 2 Kings xiv. 2, and fifteen into twenty-five in v. 23. This imputes an error which is no mere accident of transcription, but that is perhaps in any way inevitable.

Chronological Table from the Death of Solomon to the Fall of Samaria.

Queen Mother.	Accession of king in Jerusalem.	B.C.	Accession of Israelitish king.
Naamah. Maachah. (Maachah.)	Rehoboam	955	— Jeroboam.
	Abijam his son	937	
	Asa his son	935	
		934	— Nadab his son.
		932	— Baasha.
		909	— Elah his son.
		908	Zimri, Tibni, Omri.
		904	Omni (alone).
		897	Ahab his son.
		894	
Azubah.	Jehoshaphat his son	877	Ahaziah his son.
		876	Jehoram his brother.
Athaliah.	Jehoram with his father . . . (Jehoshaphat dies)	872	
	Ahaziah his son	869	
		865	
Zibiah.	(Queen) Athaliah	864	Jehu.
	Jehoash (under Jehoiada). alleged son of Ahaziah	858	
		835	— Jehoahaz his son.
Jehoaddan.		820	— Jehoash his son.
	Amaziah his son	818	
Jecholiah.		804	— Jeroboam II. his son.
	Uzziah his son	799	
Jerusha.		762	— Zachariah his son.
		761	Shallum, Menahem.
	Jotham with his father . . .	757	
[Unknown]		750	— Pekahiah son of M.
	(Uzziah dies)	748½	Pekah.
	Ahaz his son	748	
Abi.		741	
		729	Hoshea.
	Hezekiah his son	726	
	721	Samaria captured.	

From the Fall of Samaria to the Razing of the Walls of Jerusalem.

Queen Mother.	King in Jerusalem.	B.C.
Abi.	Hezekiah	726
Hepzibah.	Manasseh his son	697
Meshullemeth.	Amon his son	642
Jedidiah.	Josiah his son	640
Harmutal.	Jehoahaz his son	609
Zebudah.	Jehoiakim his brother	609
Nehushta.	Jehoiachin his son	598
Harmutal.	Zedekiah son of Josiah . . .	598
	Destruction of Jerusalem	588

Nearly to recover the common system of chronology, we must add 10 to the numbers from Uzziah to Pekah inclusive (*except Jotham*, to whom 1 only is to be added), and then add 20 to all higher dates.

nation, headed by Rezin, took place. Certainly, at this crisis Damascus bursts out into short and energetic life, the reasons of which, by combining the historical facts with the allusions of the prophets, we can conjecture with some probability. The personal character of the king, Rezin, may have had much to do with it, but the position of affairs still more.

215

Damascus now stood in the foreground, to bear the brunt of Assyrian attack; and after the recent manifestation of the power and unsparing violence of Tiglathpileser, all the states which were behind desired to uphold Damascus as their shield. If Hamath had previously been disaffected or hostile, concord now was re-established. Tyre and the whole Phœnician confederacy are likely to have tendered to Rezin pecuniary support, armour, arms, and other material of war. Besides this, in all the neighbouring districts crowds of ruined men were set loose from restraint just as in Bashan and Gilead. To say that such events gave to Rezin actual facilities, is but a conjecture; yet it is certain that he does suddenly appear at the head of powerful armies; and Isaiah, while writing the elegy to which we have referred, imagined *Israel* to be the game at which the Syrian would spring:—

220

225

Jehovah shall set up Rezin's cruel ones against him (Ephraim),
 And shall cover his enemies with mail,
 The Syrians before and the Philistines behind;
 And they shall devour Israel with open mouth.—*Isaiah* ix. 11, 12.

230

But events took quite a different course. From the cloud indeed which had gathered along the Syrian frontier, a fearful squall came down, as Isaiah had foreseen; but its rage fell on the fair ship of *Jerusalem*, which was gliding on in summer trim, after two generations of peaceful repose. The wolf-hearted Rezin was not disposed to eat up the lean sheep of Israel, when the fat kine of Judah were so near; and he chose to have Pekah as an ally,

235

conjecture with more than usual confidence. [<i>rev. 2nd ed.</i>]	213-4
affairs much more. [<i>rev. 2nd ed.</i>]	215
disaffected or in revolt, . . . [<i>rev. 2nd ed.</i>]	219-20
Gilead. Supplied with money and arms, it was easy for Rezin to raise out of these a formidable force; at any rate, it is certain . . . [<i>In the 2nd ed., this passage begins, after "Gilead.":</i>] If supplied . . . [<i>rev. 3rd ed.</i>]	224-5
the Syrian lion would spring:— [<i>rev. 2nd ed.</i>]	227-8
[<i>italics added, 2nd ed.</i>]	235
gliding on her even course in summer trim and gay prosperity, after two . . . [<i>rev. 2nd ed.</i>]	236
repose. Rezin was not . . . [<i>rev. 2nd ed.</i>]	236-7

rather than as an enemy. Their position was very similar. Pekah was doubtless embarrassed by multitudes of houseless Israelites, who, to avoid the Assyrian chain, had thrown themselves on the charity of the Ephraimites and their king. Barbarian war required no superfluous wealth or organized supplies: poverty and despair, wielding arms easily made, afforded all the needful materials of an army. Perhaps it was an obvious resource with Pekah to prey upon the sister kingdom, which had been in thriving progress, but never in amity with Israel, since the war between Jehoash and Amaziah.

Before public hostilities had visibly become inevitable, the prophet whom we have named *the elder Zechariah* composed the earlier of his pieces, which is found in our Bibles as Zech. ix., x. Although confessedly obscure, especially in the English translation, yet if viewed as written at this epoch, many points become clearer, and it gains a real historical interest. It opens as a declaration against several countries which may seem to have been in league:—

“The utterance of Jehovah’s word against the land of Hadrach;¹⁴ and upon Damascus it alights (for Jehovah has an eye upon men, and upon all the tribes of Israel); and also against Hamath, which borders thereupon; (against) Tyrus and Sidon, because it is exceeding wise.”¹⁵ Yet the most severe declarations are against Tyre and the Philistines; and we gather that the slave-trade by which these two states carried away the Jews and sold them into the Ionian cities of Asia Minor, was still (as in the days of Joel) the point which Judah felt most sensibly. The prophet proceeds to declare that Jehovah will defend his house (the house of Judah?) against hostile attacks: that a mighty King shall appear in Zion, meek and having salvation, riding on an ass, like the ancient judges; who will make away with all the apparatus of war, and speak peace to the nations; will reign from the coast of the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea, and from the brook of Egypt to the farthest end of the land. But before that happy time, Jehovah shall appear fighting for his people. Their prisoners shall be delivered from the odious dungeon. Judah and Ephraim shall be united in battle, and shall victoriously recover all the captives from the sons of Ion. Israel had indeed

14. This poetical title is not understood. Whether Hadrach is a mythical patriarch, a real king, or a god, is uncertain; as well as what land is intended. If it be *not* a synonym for Damascus, we may think of the *Hauran*, as geographically probable.

15. De Wette’s Transl.

242-5 king. There was no more obvious resource than to form them into an army and prey upon . . . [rev. 3rd ed.]

suffered chastisement for listening to idols, and the goats had been punished for the shepherds' fault;¹⁶ but Judah had been greatly exalted by Jehovah,¹⁷ and made as the goodly horse in the battle. In the farther progress of events, Judah shall be strengthened and Joseph shall be saved. Their God will gather back from far countries—especially from Egypt and Assyria—those who have been dispersed, and will plant them again in Gilead and Lebanon.¹⁸ The pride of both these heathen powers shall be brought low, and Israel shall be strong in the name of Jehovah. 275

The distinct notice here given of the large number of Israelites already resident in Egypt is important; so also is the clue to an alliance between Damascus and Tyre, though it is remarkable how Damascus vanishes from the prophecy. Of still greater moment is the proof that the idea of a Messiah had already received such sharpness. It will be observed however, that He is distinctly regarded as having the land of the twelve tribes as the limits of his proper sway. He is to be at peace with the heathen, but is not to rule over them; and their power is to be so beaten down that they dare not attack him. 280
The severe tone against Egypt—a highly friendly land—is to be imputed to its grovelling idolatry, as well as to the remembrance that it was the ancient house of bondage to Israel. 285

It is not to be imagined that the growth of Rezin reached its full height in a single year. It is more credible that support came from his allies just in proportion as he became stronger, and apparently more able to screen them from Assyria; so that his resources increased *after* his first successes against Judah. Jotham still sate on the throne of Jerusalem when the two confederates commenced this eventful war.¹⁹ The course of it, and the nature of the case, may persuade us, that their first measures were to possess themselves of the frontier fortresses, and of such other castles as were important for securing their safe passage across the country. Judæa, especially at this time,²⁰ abounded with strongholds carefully fortified; and during the life of Jotham the allied kings may have found enough to do in these preliminary occupations. A second and angry piece from the elder Zechariah appears 290
295
300

16. The *people* for the fault of the princes or *nobles*. This appears always to be the sense of *shepherds* in this prophet.

17. Namely, during the prosperous reigns of Uzziah and Jotham.

18. Whence Tiglathpileser had driven the population. *Lebanon* clearly is a poetical phrase for Galilee, as in xi. 1.

19. 2 Kings xv. 37.

20. Hosea viii. 14.

now to have been put forth,²¹ which bitterly condemns the nobles of Ephraim, while boding fresh misery to the people. Under the symbol of breaking two staves, he represents Jehovah as breaking, *first*, his own covenant with Israel, and *next*, the brotherhood between Israel and Judah. The prophet, personating Jehovah, forswears his office as Shepherd of Israel; and after breaking the shepherd's staff, receives from Israel the pay of thirty shekels for his past services, and casts the money into the treasure²² of the house of Jehovah. The opening lines are highly poetical, and betoken something like exultation in the devastations inflicted on Israel by Tiglath-pileser:—

Open thy doors, O *Lebanon*,
That the fire may devour thy cedars.
Howl, O fir tree;
315 For the cedar is fallen, the mighty is spoiled.
Howl, O ye oaks of *Bashan*;
For the steep forest is come down.
There is a voice of the shepherds' howling;
For their glory is spoiled:
320 A voice of the roaring of young lions;
For the pride of *Jordan* is desolate.

Jotham perhaps, as a prudent and experienced man, remained carefully on the defensive against the superior power of the invaders, or death happily removed him at the premature age of forty-one, before calamity came on his people. He left his kingdom at a most critical moment to his son AHAZ, who was only twenty years old.²³ We do not know how soon the resolution was taken of encountering the allied kings in the open field; but when the country began to be ravaged, the cry to oppose them would swell

21. Zech. xi. To the same period we may refer Isaiah's prophecy, contained in Isaiah xvii. 1-11, which threatens Damascus and Israel as combined powers; yet without indicating that they have *as yet* effected any mischief against Judah. (At least, if we rightly follow Ewald in adding vv. 12-14 to the following chapter.)

The prophet declares that "Damascus is *taken away from being a city*, and shall be a *ruinous heap*." If Damascus, instead of being among the most flourishing towns of Turkey, were at present suffering the same desolation as Babylon, a succession of treatises would dilate upon the fact.

22. The passage is unintelligible in the common versions, which ridiculously render this word *the potter*. The LXX. translate it by $\chi\omega\nu\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\nu$, the melting-furnace or foundry; which was far better. The two Hebrew roots רצו *to mould*, and רצא *to treasure up*, have been confounded.

23. B.C. 741.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII.

IN filling up the history, much depends on the chronological order assigned to the pieces of extant prophecy; and even where this cannot be decided so as to exclude all controversy, it becomes necessary for the historian to form a probable theory. A list is added of the *approximate* dates here imagined for the earlier prophets; partly in order to stimulate to their intelligent perusal (although the defects of the English version are a great drawback), and more especially that the reader may be able to check the narrative.

5

Approximate Dates of the Earlier Prophecies.

B.C.	
858	Accession of Jehoash under the priest Jehoiada.
840	Plague of locusts and drought. Prophecy of Joel.
818	Death of Jehoash.
804	Accession of Jeroboam II.
780	Ode against Moab, Is. xv. xvi.
770	Prophecy of Amos.
763	Hosea's first three chapters.
762	Death of Jeroboam II.
748	Uzziah dies. Isaiah has his first vision, ch. vi.
745	Captivity of Gilead and Naphthali by Tiglathpileser.
744	Isaiah ix. 8 down to x. 4.
743	Zech. ix., x.
742	Zech. xi.; Is. xvii. 1-11.—Pekah and Rezin invade Jotham.
741	Accession of Ahaz. He loses two great battles. Isaiah ii.-iv. Isaiah vii.-viii. 1, 2.
739	Isaiah viii. 4-ix. 7. Isaiah i.
738	Damascus falls by Tiglathpileser. Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii. ⁷³
733	Sargon (or his general Tartan) attacks Phœnicia and Philistia.—Is. xx.
729	Hoshea slays Pekah. Sufferings of Philistia.
726	Death of Ahaz. Isaiah xiv. 28-32.
723	Shalmaneser invades Israel the second time. Hosea's last eleven chapters. Isaiah xxviii., xxix. Micah i.-iii. 7, v.-vii.
721	Samaria taken.

73. But for the phrase "a palace of strangers" in xxv. 2, one might be tempted to explain these four chapters as Isaiah's *dirge over captured Samaria*. The fall of Damascus appears less likely to have called out so much feeling, than this nearer

B.C.	
720	Tyre besieged by Shalmaneser for five years.
717	Isaiah xxiii.
714	Isaiah v.?
713	Sennacherib invades Judah. Is. xxx.-xxxii. Is. x. 4-xi. Is. xvii. 12-xviii. (and xiv. 24-27?) Is. xxii. Is. xxxiii. Is. xxxviii. 21-35.
712	Hezekiah is sick.
708	Isaiah xix.

*

event: and so also we should see more force in the whole conclusion concerning Israel, xxvii. 6-13. But the real difficulty is to account for the prominence of Moab in ch. xxv.

*

[final textual ref. for B.C. 713:] Is. xxxvii. 21-35. [rev. 2nd ed.]

CHAPTER IX.
FROM THE FALL OF SAMARIA
TO THE DEATH OF JOSIAH, B.C. 721-609.

AS soon as the armies of Shalmaneser had effected their whole work on the hapless people of Israel, it was only to be expected that Judah would be the next victim. They had committed the same offence, and might be taxed with peculiar ingratitude; but Israel had never received any favour from the Assyrians. During the three years' war it is likely that considerable plunderings of Jewish territory took place;¹ but no formal attempt was made to reduce the strongholds; and even when Samaria had fallen, a new object intervened to give farther respite to Judæa. 5

Shalmaneser was looking beyond Jerusalem to the rich land of Egypt, and felt the importance of having all Phœnicia at his command, for the sake of its maritime aids. But of this he could not be sure, while the insular Tyre continued to defy him: its freedom was a perpetual stimulus to all Phœnicia to revolt. Expecting perhaps to capture it by a momentary exertion of force, he deferred his attack on Judah till he had accomplished it;² and ordered the subject Phœnicians to prepare 60 galleys and furnish them with rowers, intending to land his troops on the island.³ Against these, the Tyrians, abandoned by all their confederates, had only 12 to oppose; but these 12 were animated by an eager spirit of liberty, while the 60 were filled with Assyrian landsmen, and with Phœnicians engaged in a cause which they detested. The little Tyrian squadron gained a brilliant victory and captured 10 15 20

1. If this was the epoch of the composition of Isaiah i., more than mere plundering of the country was endured; for many cities were then consumed by fire. But see note ², page 247.

2. Josephus, *Antiq.* ix. 14, §2.

3. B.C. 720?

[fn. 1: 1st ed.] note 2, page 264. *[2nd ed.:]* note ², page 238. *[rev. 3rd ed.; ref. to fn. 31, p. 253 of this critical ed.]* 6

500 Assyrian warriors; whereupon Shalmaneser endeavoured to reduce the town by guarding the whole coast so as to cut off the supplies of water. The Tyrians, notwithstanding, persevered, and dug wells for themselves in their narrow island. How much water they thence obtained, and how much they
 25 imported in spite of all precautions, rests entirely on conjecture; but they lasted out until the fifth year; after which we are left in uncertainty by the historian whether the blockade was given up, or the besieged were forced to yield.⁴ The king cannot have superintended it in person for so long a time; his presence must have been needed elsewhere; and probably in the year B.C.
 30 716 he was cut off by death. Such was the first great siege endured by this heroic yet peace-loving people, against the foremost power of the world. A second was sustained successfully against Nebuchadnezzar.⁵ Sidon made a like brave resistance to Darius Ochus, and when betrayed by her own king, fell with horrible self-sacrifice. Finally, Tyre stood at bay for seven months
 35 against the great Macedonian hero,⁶ and then at last the mole which he constructed against the island, by turning it into a peninsula, spoiled for ever the advantages of the site.

It is unpleasing to find the prophet Isaiah (ch. xxiii.) exult in the dangers which came upon this noble city, while standing in the foreground for
 40 freedom, and really shielding Jerusalem from the common oppressor. We here see the evil element of exclusive patriotism, which, when imbibed by those who had not Isaiah's other great qualities, made the Jew to appear as a *hater of mankind*. In the ode itself there is no intimation that Tyre was hostile to Jerusalem: the slave-trade is not named, nor the alliance with
 45 Philistia or Syria. But here, as elsewhere, the Hebrew prophets show a narrow-minded abhorrence of worldly art, skill, and science, as producing merely wealth, pomp, luxury, and pride. This illusion is perhaps a necessary result of limited experience, in those whose moral principle has full ascendancy over the rest of their nature. Dread and grudge were felt against
 50 Tyre, "because she was exceeding wise."⁷ Jehovah was believed to share the

4. Since the above has been out of hand, Grote's third volume of Greece has appeared, in which he treats it as certain that the insular Tyre was *not* reduced by Shalmaneser: p. 428.

5. Ezekiel xxix. 18.

6. See Thirlwall's Greece, vol. vi. pp. 195-202, on this deeply interesting siege. The fate of Sidon is in p. 138 of the same volume.

7. Zech. ix. 2.

42 the Jew to be regarded as . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]

43 there is no indication that Tyre was regarded as hostile . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]

same sentiment,⁸ and to be jealous of everything grand and high. To the end of his dirge the prophet subjoins rather dark words of comfort. Tyre is to be forgotten seventy years; after which she is to take a harp and sing as a harlot; she shall turn to her harlotry with all kingdoms, and her merchandise and her hire shall be holiness to Jehovah. While stigmatizing mercantile traffic by the contemptuous name of harlotry, Isaiah could not help admitting that even merchandise might be holy,⁹ when it was spent upon the food and clothing of the priests or prophets of Jehovah. As regards the results here predicted, as well as the period of seventy years, it does not appear that they answer to any historical reality. Indeed, as this is the period assigned by Jeremiah for Babylonian domination, some critics find in it a confirmation of their suspicion that the whole chapter belongs to an author of a century later.

Out of the ruins of the kingdom of Ephraim many families must have taken refuge in Judæa, and, under the circumstances, were open to strong impressions of Jewish religion. Such as had never been present in Jerusalem at any of the great feasts, would attend the Passover there now with

8. The only sin charged against Tyre is the extensiveness of her honourable and gainful traffic.

“Who hath taken this counsel against Tyre, the crowning city, *whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers are the honourable of the earth?* Jehovah of hosts hath purposed it, *to stain the pride of all glory, and to bring into contempt the honourable of the earth*” (xxiii. 8, 9). So ii. 12-16. Compare Herodotus vii. 10, §5. “Seest thou how God striketh with his thunderbolt all tall creatures, but the little ones fret him not at all? Seest thou how he hurleth his darts always at the loftiest buildings and trees; for God loveth to lop shorter whatever is towering.”

9. “(Her wealth) shall not be treasured nor laid up; it shall be for them that dwell before Jehovah, to eat sufficiently, and for durable clothing.” This is very mean and tame; and more than any other sentiment in the ode, would help our acquiescing in the belief that the whole is of later origin.

It may be well to remark that v. 5 of this chapter in the English version gives the impression that the prophecy was written *after* great calamities on Egypt, such as the Persian conquest; but De Wette, Hitzig, and Ewald agree in rendering it, “When the news reaches Egypt, it shall be terrified by the report concerning Tyre.” The notice of the *Chaldeans* in v. 13 is very puzzling. Ewald cuts the knot by altering the word into *Canaanites*: “Behold the land of the Canaanites! This people is no more; the Assyrian has made it a wilderness.” This is a very bold, but perhaps happy conjecture.

[fn. 8: ref. to note repositioned, in the 2nd ed., from the end of the sentence.]

Babylonian ascendancy, some . . . [rev. 2nd ed.]

APPENDIX.

*

THE DESOLATION OF BABYLON.

From "THE REASONER," No. 19, November 5th, 1854.

(Referred to in p. 329.)

**

EVERY commentator and evidence-writer since controversy commenced, has delighted in extolling the circumstantial verification of the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah concerning Babylon. We shall endeavour to show that in every separate aspect of the time and causes, and of the circumstances to manifest their fulfilment to the world, the prophecies are completely falsified by history and by the actual state of the site of Babylon.

5

[Appendix, by Evans Bell, added to the 3rd ed.]

*

[ref. to p. 332 of this critical ed.]

**

[The following is omitted from Bell's article:] concerning Babylon, as forming one of the most striking proofs of the supernatural inspiration of the Bible. Even Professor Newman, whose critical labours in the cause of freethought are quite inestimable, alludes in his 'Phases of Faith' (third edition, p. 115) to the predictions against Babylon, as having been 'remarkably verified,' and in his 'Hebrew Monarchy' (second edition, p. 315) as having 'received either a most accurate or a very plausible fulfilment.' Mr. Newman, however, has not failed to perceive and to point out, in both works, the moral inanity as an example or warning of the gradual desolation of a city during more than seven centuries. 'It is absurd,' he says, 'to represent the emptiness of *modern* Babylon as a punishment of the pride of Nebuchadnezzar' ('Hebrew Monarchy,' note, p. 315). Both Mr. Newman and Mr. Greg ('Creed of Christendom,' p. 56) have also observed another fatally weak point, that the 'perpetual desolations' of Babylon and Chaldea were predicted to take place at the end of the seventy years' captivity, but did not really commence until long after. But we can do much more than this. We shall endeavour . . . [The textual refs. may be found, in this critical ed., Phases of Faith, ch. 5, lines 885-6, Hebrew Monarchy, ch. 10, lines 130-2, including textual note, and fn. 18.]

3

AFTERTHOUGHTS

ON THE FIFTY-FIRST PSALM.

(1866.)

*

IT has been accepted traditionally with strange unanimity, that King David wrote this Psalm, as its title avows, in confession of his guilt concerning Bathsheba and Uriah. But this seems doubly impossible.

First, the man who has committed murder and adultery, has pre-eminently sinned against man, and not against God only; and must have been strangely blind to write, “against *Thee only* have I sinned.” Clearly he has in his belief committed some sin against God, which is *not* a sin against man. The blood-guiltiness which in v. 14 he deplures, must have been an act, as against the sufferer, just; but involving guilt against God in the perpetrator; perhaps because of his sacred character. He seems to have been a minister or a priest; for he hopes to convert sinners; v. 13. 10

Next, the two last verses of the psalm imply that the walls of Jerusalem need repair, else are actually broken down. When Joab bravely forced his way into the city and captured it from the Jebusites, David would not have weakened the walls on purpose; nor was he likely to pray to God for their repair, but would himself at once order the work to be done. Moreover, he writes as one expecting, that, as a result of improved defences to Jerusalem, ample sacrifices will be made on the high altar. The only reasonable explanation is, that the psalm was written after the overthrow by Nebuchadnezzar. In David’s reign the ark was not yet brought to Jerusalem, nor do we hear of that city as any centre of priestly sacrifice. 15 20

I can only conclude that this personage,—priest, let me call him,—clinging to the holy land during the Babylonish captivity, had been entangled in combat with wild marauders, such as take opportunity by foreign invasion, and had slain some of them in just defence, yet felt himself contaminated by the act. For the priestly idea at the close of the monarchy was by no means 25

[*This essay (publ. 1887) is dated by the author, with the following note:]* Too late for Third Edition of my “Hebrew Monarchy,” in 1865. *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Alleged Murder of Uriah: Did David, Son of Jesse, Murder Uriah the Hittite?”
The Index 4:193 (4 September 1873): 339.
- A History of the Hebrew Monarchy, from the Administration of Samuel to the Babylonish Captivity*. London: John Chapman, 1847. 2nd ed., London: John Chapman, 1853; 3rd ed., London: N. Trübner and Co., 1865.
- “On the Fifty-first Psalm” (1866), in *Miscellanies: Essays, Tracts or Addresses, Moral and Religious*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1887. 157-58.
- “Some Considerations concerning Psalm 51.” *The Modern Review* 1 (April 1880): 439-42.

Index

- Abiathar: 70, 74, 90, 99, 106, 108, 114-15, 118 fn., 120, 308 fn.; genealogy of, 114.
Abijah: *v.* Abijam.
Abijam: 161 and fn., 167.
Abimelech: 27, 32, 53 and fn.
Abinadab: 46, 69 fn.
Abishai: 69, 79-80, 84, 98 and fn., 101, 108, 112, 114.
Abner: 81 and fn., 83-4, 362.
Abraham: 20, 34.
Absalom: 105-07.
Abydenus: 287 fn., 297 fn., 345 fn.
Adonijah: 113-15, 119.
Æschylus: 306 and fn.
Ahab, king: 173-86; wife of: *v.* Jezebel.
Ahab, prophet: 322.
Ahaz: 233, 248-49, 249 fn., 250-51, 254-57, 261.
Ahaziah, son of Ahab: 188-89.
Ahaziah, son of Jehoram: 173 fn., 194-95 and fn., 198-99, 199-200 fn.
Ahijah: 120, 142, 157, 174.
Ahikam: 330, 341-42.
Ahimelech: 66, 68-70.
Ahithophel: 106-07.
Aleppo: 94.
Alexander the Great: 79, 263, 272, 302 fn., 332 fn., 353.
Amalekites: assimilation of the, with the Simeonites, 31-32; campaigns against the, by David, 61, 69; 74-5, by Saul, 59-62; conflict of the, with the unified Hebrews, 26, 59-60, 59 fn.; territory and identity of the, 35, 59.
Amasa: 107, 108.
Amasai: 73.
Amasis: 344 fn.
Amaziah, high-priest: 228.
Amaziah, king: 219 fn., 220, 222-23, 223 fn., 228 and fn., 298, 328.
Ammonites: campaigns against the, by David, 101-04, by Saul, 55-6, 57-8, 66; origin of the, 20; relations of the, with Israel, 161, 193, 210-11, with Judah, 230-31, 334, 342, with the Scythians, 306, 308, with the Syrians, 181 and fn., 210, with the unified Hebrews, 36, 152, 153; territory of the, 36 and fn., 306.
Amnon: 105.
Amon: 296, 298 and fn., 327-28 and fn.
Amorites: 27, 30, 130.
Amos: 154, 225-28, 253-54 fn., 266, 268, 291; Joel compared with, 225, 233.
Antichrist, the: 28 fn.
Apries: *v.* Hophra.
Armenians: 277, 301.
Arnold, Thomas: 166 fn., 226 fn.
Asahel: 83.
Asa: 161, 163-64, 166-68, 166 fn., 233.
Assarac: 288 fn.
Assyrians, 221 fn., 238-43, 252; campaign of the, against Egypt, 258-59, 282-84, 285 fn., against Judah, 275-86, 297, against the Phœnicians, 258, 271-72; conquest by the, of Israel, 242-43, 260, 263, 306-07, of the Philistines, 258, of the Syrians, 253; conquest of the, by the Medes: 306 (*v.* also Medes); empire of the, 264, 286-87,

- 301-02; language and inscriptions of the, 239, 296; relations of the, with Egypt, 258-59, 262, 271, with Judah, 254-55, 255 fn., 259, 262, 271 and fn., 291, 296 fn., with the Chaldæans, 305-06.
- Astarte: 77, 141, 153, 174-75 and fns., 261 and fn., 295, 310, 316.
- Athaliah: 183, 200, 203-06.
- Augustus (Gaius Julius Cæsar Octavianus): 320 tn., 321 fn.
- Azariah, son of Jehoram: *v.* Ahaziah.
- Azariah, son of Amaziah: *v.* Uzziah.
- Baal: 49, 64 and tn., 174-75, 174 fn., 295 and fn., 299, 310, 316.
- Baalzebub: 189 and fn.
- Baasha: 162, 164-68, 166 fn., 169.
- Babylon, 121, 239, 240 tn., 241 fn., 248 fn., 287-88, 302 fn., 305, 337, 345-46, 354-55 fn. (*v.* also Chaldæans); captivity of Jews in, 317 fn., 331-32, 336-37, 336 fn., 340, 344; desolation of, in prophecy, 331-32, 331 tn., 332 fn., 351-56; siege of, 353.
- Bartholemew's Eve, St.: 201 fn.
- Baruch: 332.
- Barzillai: 107, 115.
- Bathsheba: *v.* David, wives of.
- Bell, Evans: 332 fn., 351 tn.
- Belshazzar: *v.* Nabonnedech.
- Benaiah: 80, 99, 101, 114-15, 118, 119-20.
- Benhadad I: 164-66, 172 and fn., 177-82, 184-85, 192 and fn.
- Benhadad II: 221-22, 223 and fn., 244.
- Bentley, Richard: 319.
- Berosus: as cited in Eusebius: *v.* Eusebius; as cited in Josephus: 305 fn., 331 fn., 345 fn., 348 and fn.
- Brydges, Harford Jones: 352 and fn.
- Boucher, Anne: 320 tn.
- Cambyzes: 286, 344.
- Canaanites: assimilation of the, 20-21, 25, 25-6 fn., 39-40; origin of the name of the, 26 fn.
- Caleb: 30.
- Cassius (Gaius Cassius Longinus): 298.
- Cato the Younger (Marcus Portius Cato Uticensis): 9-10.
- Chaldæans: 241, 302 fn., 304-05 and fn., 307, 308; campaign of the, against Judah, 331-40, against the Egyptians, 330-31, 331 fn., 343-44 and fns., against the Phœnicians, 343-44 and fns.; conquest of the, by the Persians, 346-48, 348 fn., 352; empire of the, 345, 352.
- Chapman, John: 12.
- Chemosh, 141, 310.
- Cherethites and Pelethites: 40, 99-100, 104, 151.
- cherubim: 129, 154.
- Chronicles, books of: 4, 7, 75 fn., 81 fn. and tn., 85-6 fn., 96 fn., 97 fn., 102 fn., 117-18 fn., 122 fns., 128 and fns., 145, 152 fn., 156, 161 fn., 166 fn., 183-84, 188 fn., 190 fn., 194-95 and fn., 196 tn., 198 fn., 208 fns., 213-14 fns., 219 and fns., 220 and fns., 223 fn., 229 fns., 230 and fn., 255-57 and fns., 280 fn., 296 and fn., 311 tn., 335.
- Chrysostom, John: 300 tn., 318.
- Chushan Rishathaim: 30, 39.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius: 284 fn., 298 fn. circumcision: 39-40, 41-2, 66-7 fn., 126, 136 fn.
- Clinton, Fynes: 275 fn., 281 fn., 297 fn., 302 fn., 305 fn.
- Colenso, John William: 101 fn., 153 fn., 175 fn.
- Coniah: *v.* Jeconiah.
- Cranmer, Thomas: 320 tn.
- Cush: 71.
- Cyaxares: 301-03, 305-06, 307 fn.
- Cyprian (Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus): 300 tn.
- Cyrus: 163 fn., 332 fn., 346, 352-53.
- Damascus: 36, 94-6, 143, 164-5, 180, 224, 245, 248 fn., 249, 253-54 and fn., 330, 356 (*v.* also Syrians).
- Daniel, book of: 330 fn., 337, 345.
- Darius I: 201 fn., 263, 283, 348 fn., 353.

- Darius II: 272.
- David: appointed as king, 63 and fn., 80-1, 85; adultery of, 103, 104-05, 359, 361; campaigns of, against the Amelékites, 61, 69, 72, against the Ammonites, 101-04, against foreign gods, 89-90, against the Philistines, 66, 66-7 fn., 67 tn., 72, 88, 93, 111-12, against the Syrians, 95-6, 95 fn., 102; flight of, from Jerusalem, 106; Goliath and, 64 and fn., 65; introduction to Saul, 64-5; reign of: ch. III; Saul's jealousy and persecution of, 66-76, 67 fn.; relations of, with the Gittites, 61, 67 fn., 71-4, 72 fn., 91, 93, 106, 151; wives of, (Abigail:) 71, 73, (Abital:) 84, (Ahinoam:) 71, 73, (Bathsheba:) 104, 113-14, 116, 363, (Eglah:) 84, (Haggith:) 84, (Macaah:) 83, (Michal:) 66, 68, 71, 84-5, 92.
- De Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht: as translator, 6; cited, 26 fn., 79 fn., 154 fn., 224 fn., 246 fn., 273 fn., 285 fn., 288 fn.; relation of, to Ewald, 6, 7.
- Deioces: 286 and fn., 296 fn., 301 (v. also Medes, relation of the, to Assyria).
- Deuteronomy: v. Pentateuch.
- development: of Mosaic ceremonies and institutions, 10, 46, 348-49 (v. also Pentateuch, the): Decalogue, 135-37, 207 fn., 316-17 fn., feast days, 133-34, 155, 291 fn., 293, law of Jubilee: v. entail, monotheism: v. monotheism, Passover, 11, 273-74, 293, 310-11, 310 fn., priesthood, 32-4, 46, 56, 90, 117-18 fn., 120, 126, 128, 133-34, 156-57, 203-05, 209, 214-15, 217, 219, 274, 292-94, 299, 314 fn., 349 (v. also Levites), Sabbath, 11, 133, 206, 291-92, 346, tithes, 33, 291, 293; of prophecy: 45, 46, 48-50, 51, 67 fn., 134, 291-92, 347, 349; of the idea of immortality (or, life after death): 288-89.
- Diodorus Siculus: 50, 239, 240 fn., 257 fn., 301 and fn.
- divination: 49-51, 74, 75-6, 75 fn., 80, 89-90, 89 fn., 93, 110, 133, 186-87, 187 fn., 256, 295.
- Doeg: 69-70.
- Edomites: campaigns against the, by David, 97-8 and fn., 160 fn., by Saul, 57, by Solomon, 142-43; conflict of the, with Judah, 177 fn., 183 and fn., 184, 189, 193-94, 210, 216, 220-21, 229, 249-50, with the Moabites, 189, 190 fn., 227; origin of the, 20; relations of the, to the conquered Judæans, 341, 347, to the unified Hebrews, 35, 70, 153; territory and identity of the, 35, 59, 98, 121.
- Egypt: commerce of, with the Hebrews, 35, 122 and fn., 124-26, 124 tn., 231-32; conquest of, in Judæan prophecy, 343-44 and fns.; migration of Hebrews into, 231-32, 247, 250 and fn., 259-61, 263, 290 and fn., 300-01, 342; monarchy of, 263 and fn.; relation of, to Ethiopia, 259, 277-79, 278 fn., 283-84, 290, to Israel, 242, 247, 259, 260-61, 262-63, to Judah, 231-32, 250, 275-76, 282-83, 290-91, 300-01, 329-31, 334, 339, to the Assyrians, 258-59, 262, 278, 284, 323 and fn., to the Chaldæans, 330-31, 331 fn., 343-44 and fns., to the Philistines, 323, to the Phœnicians, 323-24, 339, to the Scythians, 304, 322-23, to the Greeks, 322-23, 344, to the unified Hebrews, 138, 142, 158-60 and fns.; slavery of Hebrews in, 132, 247 (v. also slaves, Hebrew); the Dodecarchy of, 290, 322.
- Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried: 319.
- Elah: 168-69.
- Eleazar: 79.
- Eli: 42, 66, 120.
- Eliakim: v. Jehoiakim.
- Elijah: 175-77, 194 fn., 197, 267-68.
- Elishah: 176 and fn., 192 and fn., 198, 201, 267-68.
- Enemessar: v. Tiglathpileser.

The Works of
Francis William Newman
on Religion

A Critical Edition

10 Volumes

Each volume includes a Table of Contents, Bibliography, and Index.

I

A History of the Hebrew Monarchy

Afterthoughts:

On the 51st Psalm

Alleged Murder of Uriah

Some Considerations concerning Psalm 51

II

The Soul: Her Sorrows and Her Aspirations

III

*Phases of Faith; or, Passages from the History of My
Creed*

IV

*Hebrew Theism: The Common Basis of Judaism,
Christianity, and Mohammedism*

V

On the Church in England:

A State Church not Defensible on the Theory Espoused
by Liberal Episcopalians
Of the Illiberality of Sentiment and Practice Appre-
hended from a Separating of Church and State
Catholic Union
Moral Influence of Law
Dr. Lushington's Judgment and Feasible Church Reform
From Luther to Colenso
On the National Church
Thoughts on a Free and Comprehensive Christianity
On the Regeneration of Sunday
On Religious Endowments
Organized Priesthood
Reconstruction of the Christian Creed
What Is Disestablishment and Disendowment?
The New Crusades of the Church for the World

VI

On Early Judæo-Christian History and Doctrine:

James and Paul
The True Temptation of Jesus
Ancient Sacrifice
What Was Primitive Christianity?
Religion, not History
On Jewish Proselytism before the War of Titus
Christianity in Its Cradle
Christianity before and after Paul of Tarsus
Hebrew Jesus
Mature Thought on Christianity

VII

Life after Death? Palinodia
*Contributions to the Early History of the Late Car-
dinal Newman*

VIII

Essays, Articles, and Addresses, Part I (1841-1872):

Thoughts on the Existence of Evil
The Religious Weakness of Protestantism
On the Christian Law of Divorce
Religious Freedom
Against Religious Hero-Making
Toleration—The Pope's Encyclical
The Bigot and the Sceptic: What Is Their *Euthanasia*?
The New Testament *Inadequate* as a Standard of
Morals
Why Do I Not Call Myself a Christian?
A Reply to a Letter from an Evangelical Lay Preacher
A Reply to the Question, "What Have We Got To Rely
On, If We Cannot Rely on the Bible?"
Anthropomorphism: A Comment
Causes of Atheism
Divergence of Calvinism from Pauline Doctrine
No Science without Intuition
Romanism a Corruption of Christianity
Romanism and Primitive Christianity
On the Historical Depravation of Christianity
The Immoralities of Christendom
On Truth and Historical Truthfulness
On the Relations of Theism to Pantheism
The Two Theisms
On the Galla Religion
On the Vision of Heaven
Is Prayer a Power or a Cry of Weakness?

IX

Essays, Articles, and Addresses, Part II (1873-1889):

The Controversy about Prayer
Cruelties of False Belief
Protestantism Old and New
Intuition
On the Sects of Christendom

Religion at the Bar of Ethics
Modern Science Religious in the Long Run
The Presence of God
The Service of God
Sin against God
The Future of the Roman Church
Hunger and Thirst after Righteousness
Moral Theism
National Religion and Its Break-Up
On a Free Christian Church
Increased Study of the Bible
God, Duty and Immortality
On This and the Other World
Three Letters on “Origen and Celsus”
The Religious Mischiefs of Credulity
On Pleasure and Joy
Errors concerning Deity
What Is Christianity without Christ?
First Elements of Religion

X

Selected Book Reviews (1873-1889):

Reform of the Church of England
Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation
Explanations: A Sequel to the Vestiges of the Natural
History of Creation
Physical History of Mankind
Froude’s Philosophical Novels
John Sterling
Jowett and the Broad Church
Literature and Dogma
The Life and Teachings of Mohammed
The New Christology
Herbert Spencer
The Papal Drama
The Atheistic Controversy