
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1905.

ART. I.—"THE YEAR THAT TARTAN CAME UNTO ASHDOD" (ISA. XX.)—III.

THE reader will have observed that at the close of my last article I regarded the Egyptian and Ethiopian captives, who were to be led away within three years after the coming of the Tartan to Ashdod, as forming presumably part of the garrison of that town. I hope in this present article to be able to justify that view, but before I do so it will be necessary for me to dwell somewhat on the position occupied by Egypt in the year 711 B.C., a matter with which the subject of this paper is very closely concerned.

At the time when Isaiah uttered the prophecy contained in chapter xx. of his book Egypt was under an Ethiopian suzerainty. The Ethiopian rulers of Egypt were themselves Egyptians, but not of pure descent, their faces betraying an admixture of the negro type. Napata, the centre of their power, was situated in a bend of the Nile, where the river flows in a southerly direction, a little below the Fourth Cataract. The town stood in the plain at the foot of the modern Gebel Barkal, a sandstone cliff which rises perpendicularly to a height of 200 feet. This cliff, called the Sacred Mount, was supposed to be the dwelling of the god Amun, by whom the Kings of Ethiopia were appointed to their office, and as whose priests they acted.

The Ethiopian invasion of Egypt took place in the days of the Twenty-third (Tanite) Dynasty. The country was at that time in an unsettled, disorganized condition, under the rule of more than one legitimate Pharaoh. This state of things afforded an opportunity to Tafnekht, a man of obscure origin but of great energy and talent, of establishing his power, first at Sais and in the Western Delta, and then up the river as far as

Heracleopolis. The petty princes of the Said and the Delta, who still remained unconquered, alarmed at the rapid spread of Tafnekht's power, called in the aid of the Ethiopian King, Piônkhi Miamun, who invaded Egypt and advanced as far north as Heliopolis. On a stele, discovered at Gebel Barkal in the year 1862 and now in the Boulak Museum, Piônkhi has left us an interesting and somewhat amusing account of the invasion.[1] It appears that ultimately Tafnekht, who had fled to an island in the Mediterranean, professing himself overcome with terror, sent his ambassador, made his humble submission to the Ethiopian King, and took the oath of allegiance in the presence of Piônkhi's envoys. This astute ruler, however, in the hour of his seeming defeat, managed matters so cleverly that he contrived to obtain from the conqueror a formal recognition of his rule at Sais, even although the Twenty-third Dynasty was still nominally in power. On the retirement of Piônkhi to Ethiopia, Tafnekht, though still acknowledging the Ethiopian supremacy, was able yet further to consolidate and extend his power. On his death he was succeeded by his son Bukunirinif, the Bocchoris of the Greek writers, the sole representative, according to Manetho, of the Twenty-fourth Dynasty. Unfortunately, very little is known about this prince from native sources, but in the year of Sargon's accession, 722 B.C., he appears to have assumed the rank of Pharaoh, a usurpation in which the Ethiopians, busied in their own affairs, seem to have acquiesced, even although it involved a partial repudiation of their own supremacy. Meanwhile Piônkhi had died, and shortly after his death an Ethiopian of the name of Kashto had succeeded in making his way from the throne of Thebes to that of Napata.

Such, then, was the state of things when, in 720 B.C., Sargon met and defeated an Egyptian army at Raphia. The brief account of this defeat on the Khorsabad Inscription runs thus:

"Hanun, King of Gaza, along with Sib'e, the Tartan of Egypt, came against me at Raphia to offer battle and combat. I put them to the rout. Sib'e avoided the shock of my arms; he fled, and his whereabouts was not seen. Hanun, King of Gaza, I captured."

In the parallel passage in the Annals the scribe introduces a playful touch, and since the same cuneiform character which has the syllabic value *sib*, when taken as an idiogram, also signifies "a shepherd," he assures us that "Sib'e, *like a shepherd robbed of his sheep*, fled away alone."

The above account of the battle of Raphia, while it shows

[1] For a translation of this stele, see "Records of the Past," First Series, vol. ii., pp. 79-104.

incidentally how readily at this time the small States of Palestine looked to Egypt for help, is of special interest to the student of Scripture because of the mention of Sib'e, or Sibhe, who is evidently the " So," or rather " Seve,"[1] to whom Hoshea sent his messengers, as stated in 2 Kings xvii. 4, and who is there called " King of Egypt." In what relation this person stood to Bocchoris or to Kashto is uncertain. He may have been a sub-king, a vassal of the former, reigning in the Delta; or, again, he may have been Shabaku or Sabaco, the son of Kashto and future ruler of the Ethiopian-Egyptian empire. That Sib'e is to be identified with Sabaco, Dr. Pinches assures us, is the general opinion of scholars; but he himself points out one objection to this identification—viz., that in the Annals of Assurbanipal Sabaco's name is correctly written *Shabaku*.[2] Further, during the reign of Bocchoris, the Ethiopian suzerainty over Egypt seems to have been almost in abeyance. But if there be some difficulty in establishing the identity of Sib'e with Sabaco there is at least, no doubt as to his position and office. The Assyrian scribe, in giving him the title *Tar-ta-nu, Tur-tan-nu,* means to indicate that he was commander of the Egyptian army. If we had only the former reading we might be tempted to read the characters *shil-dha-nu*,[3] " ruler," since the same cuneiform character has the values *tar* and *shil*, whilst *ta* and *dha* are also expressed by one character. But the variation *tur* instead of *tar*, which occurs in the Annals, leaves us in no doubt that we have here the style and title of the Assyrian commander in-chief somewhat curiously transferred to the head of an Egyptian army.

In 716 B.C., four years after the battle of Raphia, Shabaku succeeded his father Kashto on the throne of Ethiopia. This monarch is recognised by Manetho as the first King of the Twenty-fifth (Ethiopian) Dynasty. Being an able and energetic prince, and unable to tolerate any rival, he at once declared war against Bocchoris, and in the following year captured him and burnt him alive. Having thus made himself master of all Egypt, he in the same year offered gifts to Sargon, along with Samsi, the Arabian Queen, and Itamar the Sabæan. In the Annals of Sargon's seventh year he is spoken of as *Pir'u shar mâtu Mutsuri*, " Pharaoh, King of Egypt," and his act of homage is recorded immediately after the description of

---

[1] With a different punctuation the Heb. סוֹא, *So*, may be read סֵוֵא, *Seve*.

[2] See the Annals of Assurbanipal, Col. ii. 22.

[3] Whence the modern " Sultan."

Sargon's victories in Northern Arabia.[1] Such an act was most politic on the part of a prince who had but recently established his rule over so vast an empire. We must look upon it as a sign of wisdom, rather than a mark of weakness. Indeed, the sway of Shabaku, so far as Egypt was concerned, was a very different thing to that of Piônkhi. Once set up, it was quickly consolidated, so that by the time of the Ashdod troubles (712-711 B.C.), Egypt, according to Professor Maspero, was united from end to end.[2]

The new empire of Egypt-Ethiopia, which had so rapidly risen to a place in the first rank, must have appeared to the petty States of Palestine as a most formidable rival to Assyria, and therefore likely to prove a deliverer to them. Its duality was, no doubt, regarded by them as a source of strength, rather than of weakness, for Egypt could now draw on the vast resources of Ethiopia, whilst her armies would be led and reinforced by a martial race, the "nation tall and smooth,"[3] described by Herodotus as *μέγιστοι καὶ κάλλιστοι ἀνθρώπων πάντων*. This strong trust on the part of the Jews and other Palestinian States in the Egyptian-Ethiopian power is vividly portrayed in the prophecy now before us, in which, as if to emphasize the dual character of the great empire which had so suddenly risen up, the language is made to fall into pairs in a very marked manner.[4] Thus, the prophet is to walk "naked and barefoot"—"for a sign and a wonder" —"upon Egypt and upon Ethiopia." Also, the King of Assyria is to lead away "the captives of Egypt and the exiles of Ethiopia"—"young and old"—"naked and barefoot"; whilst those who had looked to the dual empire for help are to be "dismayed and ashamed"—"because of Ethiopia their expectation, and of Egypt their glory." Thus derisively does the prophetic message harp on that characteristic which seemed to the men of those days to form the strength of the newly-risen power.

It will be noticed that the picture given us in this chapter of the strong trust placed by the States of Palestine in the Egyptian-Ethiopian power is in exact agreement with the

[1] Owing to a misleading plan, sometimes adopted by the Assyrian scribes, of grouping events geographically rather than historically, this homage of the Pharaoh is placed in the Khorsabad Inscription immediately after the account of the battle of Raphia, which took place five years before. Similarly, in the Nimrûd Inscription of Tiglathpileser III. we find blended together the events of two Chaldean campaigns undertaken in the years 745 B.C. and 731 B.C. respectively.

[2] See Maspero's "Passing of the Empires," p. 252. I am chiefly indebted to this writer for my sketch of Egyptian affairs.

[3] Isa. xviii. 2, 7 (Revised Version).

[4] See Stade, "De Isaiæ Vaticiniis Æthiopicis," pp. 67, 68.

record on the broken cylinder K 1,668, where Sargon informs us that Philistia, Judah, Edom and Moab, at that time Assyrian tributaries, had even gone so far as to form a secret alliance with Shabaku. His words are: "The people of Philistia, Judah, Edom, and Moab, dwelling beside the sea, bringing the tribute and gift of Assur my lord, speaking seditions and acting with base wickedness . . . in order to stir up rebellion against me, to Pharaoh, King of Egypt, a prince who did not save them, brought their offerings of peace and requested an alliance." It was either to dissuade from such an alliance, or, at any rate, to show the fruitlessness of it, that Isaiah uttered this striking prophecy. To all outward appearance, the vigorous beginning of Shabaku's reign seemed to point to Egypt-Ethiopia as the future world-power; but the prophet, taught of God, dared to predict that within a short fixed time Egypt and Ethiopia should suffer the deepest humiliation, and from some unexplained cause be powerless to retaliate.[1] Strings of Egyptian and Ethiopian captives would then be seen on their way to Assyria, marching in that same shameful condition which we see depicted again and again by Shalmaneser II. (860-825 B.C.) on the gates of Balawât.[2] Then, "in that day, the inhabitants of this coastland,"[3] or, to quote the well-nigh parallel phrase of Sargon, "the people of Philistia, Judah, Edom, and Moab, *dwelling beside the sea*," would say, in the deepest consternation, "Behold, such is our expectation, whither we fled for help to be delivered from the King of Assyria: and we, how shall we escape?"

But it may be asked, What proof have we that there were

---

[1] We do not know how it was that Shabaku, an able and energetic ruler in his own kingdom, was so powerless against the might of Assyria. Perhaps the explanation is to be found in the wonderful activity of Sargon, "the fiery flying serpent" of Isa. xiv. 29. Or, again, it may be that the armies of Egypt were no match for the military genius of the Assyrians.

[2] This monument of ancient art, to be seen in the Assyrian Saloon at the British Museum, is most instructive as to the usages of war practised by the Assyrians. Strings of naked captives are depicted in the siege and capture of Suguni, a city in Ararat, and also in the capture of the Syrian town Khazazi. For a Scripture parallel to Isa. xx. 4 B. Stade very aptly points to 2 Sam. x. 4, the treatment inflicted by Hanun on David's ambassadors, but can find no instance of captives being led naked on the monuments of Assyria. His learned essay, "De Isaiæ Vaticiniis Æthiopicis," was written six years before the discovery of the Gates of Balawât by Rassam in 1879.

[3] "This isle," or "coastland"—Kimchi, Vitringa, Gesenius, Delitzsch, Birks, and George Adam Smith understand this term of the whole of Palestine, an interpretation confirmed by the language of Sargon. Others have taken it to refer to the kingdom of Judah only. Stade applies it to Ashdod.

any Egyptian and Ethiopian troops in Ashdod at the time of its fall? I answer that on *a priori* grounds it is very probable that there were. The Philistine cities would hardly dare to withstand the military power of Assyria in their own might. In this instance they had not only found a coalition with the neighbouring States, but, in common with those States, it was to Egypt that they had "fled for help to be delivered from the King of Assyria." As Sargon himself testifies, they were already in alliance with Egypt. Since then it was so evidently Shabaku's interest to use them as a buffer State between his own country and Assyria, what could be more likely than that he should send a picked body of troops to help to defend one of their strongest cities? This could easily be done even up to the last moment; for, if the land approaches were blocked by the invader, still the sea was open. Ashdod had a port of its own, and the Assyrian was no sailor.[1]

But by far the strongest proof of the presence of Egyptian and Ethiopian troops within the walls of Ashdod at the time of the siege lies embedded in this prophecy itself. For the passage can only have two interpretations:[2] either it is to be understood in the way I have just indicated, or else it points to the conquest of Egypt and Ethiopia on a large scale. This latter interpretation, which at first sight seems to suit so well the language used, nevertheless cannot be maintained because of the state of things so graphically depicted in the prophecy. "The people of this coastland"—*i.e.*, the inhabitants of Palestine generally—are represented as trembling with fear while they view the long train of Ethiopian and Egyptian captives on their way to exile. They are trembling with fear; still it is evident that their own fate, though it seems close at hand, has not yet come. The sight of Egypt's failure, and her deep disgrace, draws from their lips the anxious question, "And we, how shall we escape?" But that very question itself shows that *as yet they themselves are still untouched.* Now, is it likely, we may ask, that an Assyrian army should proceed to overrun Egypt, leaving behind it in its rear a number of

[1] The words of Amos iii. 9, "Publish ye in the palaces at Ashdod and in the palaces of the land of Egypt," are significant as to the importance of Ashdod some fifty years before the time at which we are looking, and point possibly to some connection then existing between that town and Egypt.

[2] A third interpretation is, indeed, given by B. Stade, but one so far-fetched that it seems to me to be out of the question. Identifying Melukhkha with Ethiopia, he maintains that the words of ver. 6 are put into the lips of fugitives from Ashdod, who, along with Yamani, have fled for refuge to the King of Melukhkha—*i.e.*, to the Ethiopian King of Egypt. See "De Isaiæ Vaticiniis Æthiopicis," p. 74.

small States, seething with rebellion, but as yet untouched? What was it that hindered Sennacherib in his advance on Egypt? Was it not his failure to take the strong fortress of Jerusalem? It was dangerous for him to advance beyond a certain point as long as Jerusalem remained intact in his rear. Since then Isaiah depicts the coastland of Southern Syria as still unsubdued at the time when the shameful spectacle passes through, we are forced to conclude that it must be from Ashdod, and not from Egypt, that the captives come, and that the town is pictured in the prophet's prediction as having fallen before the might of Assyria. This explains the parenthesis in ver. 1, "and he fought against Ashdod and took it," which was no doubt inserted to assure the reader that Isaiah's prediction was fulfilled.

Some, however, will ask whether the expression "young and old" in ver. 4 does not point to some more wholesale deportation of Egyptian and Ethiopian captives than could result from the capture of Ashdod. To such I would answer that, while these words taken alone might very naturally be supposed to describe the leading of a nation into exile, still there is another sense which they admit of, and which, in view of the proof just given, we are forced to put upon them. The prophet means to say that as the Assyrian would show himself utterly regardless of decency, so he would be devoid of all pity for the young or respect for the aged. A parallel to this passage may be found in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17, where it is said of the King of the Chaldees that at the taking of Jerusalem he "had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age." Such an interpretation is also agreeable to the tone and spirit of this Book of Isaiah, respect for the aged being a characteristic of our prophet.[1]

I have now completed my exegesis of the passage, but there are still some points which call for notice in the extracts from the inscriptions of Sargon given in my first paper.

In the inscription on the broken cylinder K. 1,668, Sargon speaks of the States of Southern Palestine as seeking an alliance with "Pharaoh, King of Egypt, *a prince who did not save them.*" The words might simply mean that the Pharaoh was powerless to help his allies, or that he took no steps to do so. But there is, methinks, a dry caustic tone about this brief remark, giving it the character of an ironical reflection. Sargon means to hint that the Pharaoh *tried, and was not able;* nay, more, he met with just such an ignominious blow to his prestige as the Jewish prophet had foretold.

[1] See iii. 2-5, ix. 15, xlvi. 4, xlvii. 6.

The town, which, according to my interpretation of Isaiah (chap. xx.), had admitted Egyptian and Ethiopian troops within its walls, according to Sargon, had chosen a Greek adventurer for its King. This adventurer is called Yatna in the Annals, and Yamani in the other inscriptions. This interchange of names is most instructive. Yamani "Ionian," is the same word as the "Javan" of Gen. x. 2, and denotes a Greek from Asia Minor or the Islands. In his Cylinder Inscription Sargon boasts that he has "drawn out the Yamanians in the midst of the sea like fish," for the Assyrians being an inland people were very proud of anything they were able to do on the sea. The name Yatna tells us the particular island from which the adventurer came, for it is the Assyrian name for Cyprus. Thus Yamani-Yatna must have been a native of Cyprus of Ionian race.[1] Commenting on these two names, Professor McCurdy makes the following apt observations: "These phrases indicate that the Greek adventurers, who, as pirates, kidnappers, and slave-dealers (Joel iii. 6; Zech. ix. 13), had for centuries been harrowing the Mediterranean coasts as far as Egypt, had now an actual settlement in Ashdod and its vicinity, and were aspiring to a leading place. We could not wish for a better explanation than this fact affords of a passage written a few years before: 'And a spurious race (LXX. ἀλλογενεῖς) shall have its seat in Ashdod, and I will cut off the pride of the Philistines' (Zech. ix. 6)."[2]

It will be observed that Sargon calls the people of Ashdod the "Khatte." The name is identical with the "Kheta" of the Egyptian hieroglyphs and the "Hittites" of Scripture. But we must not conclude from this that the Philistines were regarded as Hittites by the Assyrians. The term *mât Khatte*, "land of Heth," was the Assyrian name, as Dr. Pinches tells us, for the whole of Southern Syria, including Samaria, Sidon, Arvad, Gebal, Ashdod, Beth-Ammon, Moab, Edom, Ashkelon, and Judah.[3] It points undoubtedly to the former predominance of that mysterious and interesting people. So then the men of Ashdod are called "Hittites" merely because their town lies in what was formerly the land of the Hittites.

Besides the mother city of Ashdod, Sargon captured the dependent towns, Gimtu and Asdudimmu. Gimtu is the Hebrew גַּת *Geneth*, of which *Gath* is a contraction. It is

[1] The population of Cyprus was of a mixed character, partly Greek, partly Phœnician. In the days of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal the island was under several Greek Kings.

[2] "Prophecy, History, and the Monuments," vol. ii., p. 418.

[3] See Pinches' "Old Testament," p. 322.

uncertain whether the ancient and famous Philistine city is here meant. The absence of any mention of Gath in Amos i. 6-8, Zech. ix. 5-7, Zeph. ii. 4, and Jer. xxv. 20, where all the other four chief cities of Philistia are mentioned, lends colour to the view that it fell into insignificance after its dismantlement by Uzziah,[1] and renders it not unlikely that it may now have been under the sway of Ashdod, from which city it was distant only some ten miles in a south-south-eastern direction.[2] In harmony with the silence of the above passages of Scripture as to Gath is the fact that from the time of Tiglath-pileser III. onwards no mention is made of Gath in the Assyrian historical inscriptions, though we hear from time to time of the other four cities. On the Tablets of Tel-el-Amarna, written about 1400 B.C., Gath, Gaza, and Ashkelon are all mentioned.

The name Asdudimmu is with some probability interpreted by Professor Franz Delitzsch as "Ashdod by the Sea," *immu* being equivalent to the Hebrew יָם, *yâm* "sea."[3] In this case it would represent the port of Ashdod, distant some two miles from the lofty Tel which formed the citadel.

Melukhkha, the country to which Yamani fled, was formerly thought to be the Ethiopian kingdom of Meroe. It is now regarded by most authorities as a name for the Sinaitic Peninsula. Jensen compares the name with an Arabic word signifying "desert." Sayce interprets it as "the salt land," the salt desert between Egypt and Palestine. Compare the Hebrew מֶלַח (*melakh*), "salt," and the names "The Salt Sea" (Gen. xiv. 3) and "The Valley of Salt" (2 Sam. viii. 13).

In line 222 of the Annals Sargon speaks of himself as "riding in my war chariot," where the literal rendering is "the chariot of my feet." Again, in line 124 he speaks of "the cavalry of my feet." These expressions are equivalent to "the chariot that waits on me," "the cavalry that attend me." Compare the words of Benhadad in 1 Kings xx. 10: "The gods do so unto me and more also, if the dust of Samaria shall suffice for handfuls for all the people that follow me," literally "that are at my feet." See also Exod. xi. 8 and Judges iv. 10.

In line 223 of the Annals we find the King using the following strange expression with regard to his cavalry: "Who do not retreat from the place of the turning of my hands." Com-

[1] See 2 Chron. xxvi. 6. The mention of Gath in Micah i. 10 is of a proverbial character, derived from 2 Sam. i. 20.

[2] See 1 Sam. v. 7, 8.

[3] See the "Paradies," p. 290.

pare with this 1 Kings xxii. 34, where Ahab says to his charioteer, "Turn thine hand and carry me out of the host," literally "turn thy *hands*," because, as noted in the "Speaker's Commentary" *in loco*, "the driver of a chariot both in Egypt and Assyria held the reins with his two hands." Compare also 2 Kings ix. 23. When the Great King says that his cavalry do not retreat from the place of the turning of his hands, he means that in whatever direction he drives his faithful bodyguard will go with him.

In the extract from the Khorsabad Inscription Sargon speaks of some long-ago period as "the *adu* of Nannar." He declares that the Kings of Melukhkha from ancient days, the *adu* of Nannar, had never been known to pay homage to the Kings of Assyria. Nannar is the Babylonian name of the moon-god, Sin; and *adu* has here the sense of the Greek *αἰών*, "age." The "*adu* of Nannar" is, then, the age or epoch of the moon, as is well explained by Winckler.[1] He points out that in the planetary system the moon-god was the father of the gods; also that in the sixth millennium B.C., owing to the precession of the equinoxes, the beginning of the year, which was ruled by the Vernal Equinox, fell, not on the first of Nisan, but in the third month Sivan, which was sacred to the moon. Thus by the *adu* of Nannar Sargon means the first dawn of Babylonian history. In Ps. lxxxix. 37, curiously enough, we find the Hebrew עַד, *ȧd*=*adu* also used in connection with the moon. In accordance with the laws of strict parallelism, this verse may be rendered thus:

> "As the moon which is established for ever,
> And as the epoch (*ȧd*) in the sky of long continuance."

The Psalmist's words thus rendered may be understood in a sense somewhat similar to that of Sargon, the word *ȧd* signifying the whole period from the dawn of history up to the time of the writer; or we may give them that grander sense—viz., the period from the moon's creation—which suits better the context, seeing that it is the Creator who is speaking.

CHARLES BOUTFLOWER.

NOTE 1.—*On the Ethiopian Kings of Egypt of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty.*

The following summary may be of interest to the reader:

716 B.C.—Shabaku (Sabaco), the son of Kashto, King of Ethiopia.

704 B.C.—Shabitoku (Sebichos), the son of Shabaku, whose troops, led by Tirhakah, fought with Sennacherib at Eltekeh in 701 B.C.

693 B.C.—Taharqa (Tarakos), the Tirhakah of 2 Kings xix. 9, and Tarqu, of the Assyrian monuments. He was a man of royal—*i.e.*, of

[1] See "Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament," pp. 332, 333.

priestly—descent. In his reign Egypt was invaded by Esarhaddon in 670 B.C., and again in 668-667 B.C. On the latter occasion the Assyrian King died on the march, but his troops pressed on, and, according to one account, advanced as far as Thebes.

666 B.C.—Tanuatamanu, called Tandamanu by Assurbanipal. He was a son of Shabaku and a stepson of Taharqa, who had married Shabaku's widow. In the fourth year of his reign took place the sack of Thebes (No-amon) by the Assyrians, as described in the Annals of Assurbanipal. It is to this that the prophet Nahum refers (chap. iii. 8-10) in his solemn warning to the ruthless conqueror. Egypt shook off the Assyrian yoke *circa* 650 B.C. Nahum's prophecy was fulfilled in the fall of Nineveh, *circa* 606 B.C.

NOTE 2.—*On the Order of the Three Prophecies in Isaiah (chaps. xviii., xix., and xx.).*

The first of these prophecies in chap. xviii. belongs apparently to the time of the invasion of Sennacherib, and was uttered probably in the year of its fulfilment—*i.e.*, in 701 B.C. See verses 5, 6.

The prophecy against Egypt in chap. xix. speaks of a time of civil war in that country, to be followed by the rule of a "cruel lord" and a "fierce king." This description of the conqueror "suggests," as Cheyne observes, "a complete stranger to the culture of Egypt—*i.e.*, an Assyrian rather than an Ethiopian conqueror." It therefore points forward to the Assyrian conquest of Egypt, begun by Esarhaddon in 670 B.C., and completed by Assurbanipal in 662 B.C. How long it was uttered before its fulfilment we cannot tell, but the glorious evangelic close (vers. 23-25) is suggestive of the old age of the prophet. Isaiah can hardly have lived to witness its fulfilment, not only on the score of age, but because of the fact disclosed by the monuments that Manasseh was on the throne of Judah during the latter part of the reign of Esarhaddon.

The prophecy of Isaiah, chap. xx., belonging to the year 711 B.C., is the earliest of the three; but it is placed last because of its close chronological connection with what follows. Chap. xxi. 1-10 is virtually an answer to the question at the close of chap. xx., "And we, how shall we escape?" Read in the light of history, it shows, as a matter of fact, how it came about that they *did* escape.

ART. II.—HISTORICAL METHODS AND ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS.

AMONG the great and lasting achievements of the nineteenth century has been the acquisition of that faculty, or fact, which may be described, in one aspect of it, as the sense of historical perspective. It is a faculty of the highest value, because it puts into our hands a new weapon of precision. It is a fact, so far as it influences, and even dominates, not only the wide realm of history, but the wider and more various fields of literature, as well as every branch of learning which is dependent on those two great subjects. In other words, this new faculty of ours throws a fresh and