

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF 2 K. 20 7-11 — I. 38 7, 8, 21 f.

KEMPER FULLERTON

OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

THE major difficulties in the parallel accounts of the miracle of the so-called sun-dial of Ahaz are sufficiently obvious and have often been discussed<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Table I

K. 7 = I. 21

H. of K. 7	עַל הַשָּׁחֵן וַיְחִי	וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ	וַיִּקְחוּ	רֵבֶלֶת תַּגְּמִים	וַיִּקְחוּ	וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ	וַיִּקְחוּ	וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ
G. retranslated	וַיְחִי	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
H. of I. 21	וַיְחִי	"	"	וַיִּקְרְאוּ	—	"	"	"
G. retranslated	וַיְחִי	עַל הַשָּׁחֵן	וַיִּקְרְאוּ	וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ	—	תַּגְּמִים	"	מֵל חֻקְרֵיהֶם קָם

(Syro-hex)

K. 7. reconstructed out of H. and G.

וַיִּקְחוּ וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ וַיִּקְחוּ רֵבֶלֶת תַּגְּמִים וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ עַל הַשָּׁחֵן וַיְחִי וַיִּקְחוּ וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ עַל הַשָּׁחֵן וַיְחִי  
(Targ., Syr.)

G. of K. 7	Kal elven	—	—	λαβέτωσαν παλάθην σίκων και ἐπιθήτωσαν ἐπὶ τὸ ἕλος και ὑγιάσει
G. of I. 21	Kal elven	Ἡσάλας πρὸς Ἐφεσίων	Ἄδβε	παλάθην ἐκ σίκων και τριψων και κατάπλασαι — — — και ὑγιήσῃ

Table II

K. 8-11 = I. 7-21

A. Hebrew

K. 8	וַיִּמְדוּ חֻקְרֵיהֶם מֵל אֲשֶׁר יִרְדֶּה בְּמַעְלֹת אֲשֶׁר יִרְדֶּה בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי בֵּית יְהוָה
I. no parallel	— — — — —
K. 9 <sup>a</sup>	וַיִּמְדוּ חֻקְרֵיהֶם מֵל אֲשֶׁר יִרְדֶּה בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי
I. 7	וַיִּמְדוּ חֻקְרֵיהֶם מֵל אֲשֶׁר יִרְדֶּה בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי
K. 9 <sup>b</sup> -11 <sup>a</sup>	וַיִּמְדוּ חֻקְרֵיהֶם מֵל אֲשֶׁר יִרְדֶּה בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי
I. 8 <sup>a</sup>	וַיִּמְדוּ חֻקְרֵיהֶם מֵל אֲשֶׁר יִרְדֶּה בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי
K. 11 <sup>b</sup>	וַיִּמְדוּ חֻקְרֵיהֶם מֵל אֲשֶׁר יִרְדֶּה בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי
I. 8 <sup>b</sup>	וַיִּמְדוּ חֻקְרֵיהֶם מֵל אֲשֶׁר יִרְדֶּה בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי וְעַלִּיתִי בְּיַמֵּי יְרֵמְיָהוּ לִי

1) The cure, K. 7, precedes the assurance of the cure. This has long been felt to be an unnatural sequence.

2) The declarative statement, K. 9 a, *This shall be a sign* —, is followed by the offer of an alternative: *Which of two kinds of sign does Hezekiah prefer?* (K. 9 b). The incongruity of these two clauses has also been increasingly felt in recent times.

3) The equivalents of K. 7 and 8 (the cure of Hezekiah, and the king's request for a sign) are found in Isaiah *after* the offer of the sign (L 21 and 22) instead of *before* it as in K. So far as the request for a sign is concerned (L 22 — K. 8), its position after the sign has been given is manifestly impossible. So far as the prescription of the fig poultice and Hezekiah's cure are concerned (K. 7 — L 21) their position after the sign in I. would be better than their position before it in K., were it not that the text of L 21 no longer refers to the cure but only to the prescription. The result is that there is no reference at all in Isaiah to the cure, except the incidental one in the title of the interpolated poem of Hezekiah (L 8) which is not a part of the narrative. Thus the advantage that might have been secured by the transposition of the equivalent of K. 7 to the end of the narrative, after the sign, is forfeited by the alteration of the text. In K. the cure is in the wrong place; in L it is omitted altogether from the narrative<sup>2</sup>.

B. Greek

K. 8-10 · Like H. except *τοπεισεναι* = *קל*, instead *קל* at v. 8<sup>b</sup>

K. 11 retranslation of G.  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 11^a \text{ ויקרא ישעיהו הנביא אל יהוה} \\ 11^b \text{ וישב העל במעלות} \end{array} \right. \text{ — — — — — } \text{אחרנית עשר מעלות}$

K. 11 (G.)  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 11^a \text{ Kal \textit{\epsilon}b\eta\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \textit{H}eraias \textit{\delta} \textit{proph\eta\eta\tau\eta\zeta} \textit{p}o\textit{s} \textit{e}p\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu} \\ 11^b \text{ Kal \textit{\epsilon}p\textit{\iota}st\textit{r}\phi\textit{\epsilon}i\textit{s} \textit{\eta} \textit{e}k\textit{a}t\textit{\epsilon} \textit{e}n \textit{to}i\textit{s} \textit{d}e\textit{k}\textit{a} \textit{d}e\textit{k}\textit{a} \textit{b}\textit{a}\textit{t}\textit{h}\textit{m}\textit{a}i\textit{s} \textit{e}i\textit{s} \textit{t}\textit{a} \textit{o}u\textit{t}\textit{o}u \textit{d}\textit{e}\textit{k}\textit{a} \textit{b}\textit{a}\textit{t}\textit{h}\textit{m}\textit{a}i\textit{s}.} \end{array} \right.$

I. 8<sup>a</sup> Retranslation of G. *הנביא ישיב את העל במעלות אשר ירדה עשר מעלות בית אֲבִיךָ השמש* — — — — — *ששב השמש עשר מעלות אשר ירדה העל* — — — — — variant

L. 8<sup>a</sup> G. *Μὲν εὖν στρέψω τῆς σκῆης τῆς δεκάβαθμῶν οὗτε ἀντίβη τοῦ δεκά δεκάβαθμῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πατρὸς σου ὁ ἥλιος, — (variant) ἀποστρέψω τὸν ἥλιον τοῦ δεκά δεκάβαθμῶν.*

I. 8<sup>b</sup> Retranslation of G. *וְיָשֵׁב הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ עֶשְׂרֵי מַעֲלוֹת — אֲשֶׁר יֵרֵד הָעַל*

L. 8<sup>b</sup> G. *Καὶ ἀντίβη ὁ ἥλιος τοῦ δεκά δεκάβαθμῶν οὗτε ἀντίβη ἢ σκῆ.*

<sup>2</sup> I have found only one commentator who has the hardihood to defend the originality of both K. 7 and 8 and L 21 and 22 in their present forms. Alexander of Princeton suggests that L 21, 22 are a first draft by Isaiah himself, appended as a kind of after-thought, whereas K. 7 and 8

4) Finally, in addition to the above major difficulties within each of the two narratives, their relationship to each other also presents a serious problem. In K. the sign is given at the request of Hezekiah, and, further, the king is given a choice between two alternatives. In I. the prophet offers the sign of his own accord and defines the precise nature of it himself, no choice being allowed. The solution of the above difficulties proposed by Stade<sup>3</sup>, and to be described hereafter, has been the one commonly adopted with but slight variations since his day<sup>4</sup>. This solution in its main outlines I believe to be the correct one. What follows is an attempt to clear up more completely, if possible, the puzzling problems presented by the texts of the parallel accounts and thus to strengthen Stade's main critical conclusions.

## I

## ON THE TEXT OF THE SIGN, K. 9-11 — I. 7, 8.

1) The verb  $\text{לָרַחַק}$  at K. 9 b is in a very harsh construction. If it is retained, the sentence can be naturally translated only: *The shadow has gone down ten steps*<sup>5</sup>. But in that case

represent a revision by the same author. It would scarcely be worth while to mention this curiosity were it not that this ancient apologetic trick is being reintroduced by some of our most up-to-date modern commentators. See Hans Schmidt at I. 2, 12, 19.

<sup>3</sup> ZATW 1886 p. 183 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Duhm, Dillmann, Marti, Cheyne (*Intro.*), H. Schmidt, Eissfeldt (in Kautzsch<sup>6</sup>) Kittel (*Könige*), Benzinger. Meinhold (*Jesajaerzählungen*, p. 5-8), while adopting certain suggestions of Stade, gives an elaborate reconstruction of the text which forfeits some of the main advantages of Stade's criticism and which does not seem to me to do justice to the textual evidence.

<sup>5</sup> I shall preserve the translation "steps" for  $\text{מַשְׁבָּעִים}$  everywhere in Kings and Isaiah. But it must be remembered that it is used with two slightly different shades of meaning. It is used as an accusative of measurement for the distance which the sun or the shadow seems to move (i. e. degrees), and also for the apparatus upon which or by which this apparent motion is indicated. Just what the exact nature of this apparatus is cannot now be ascertained. The translation sundial goes back to the Targum. The two shades of meaning just noted are

the sentence does not agree with what follows, which very clearly implies that an alternative has been offered. If **והלך** is preserved, the **אם** clause could scarcely have followed. Stade conjectures that some such clause as **ישב אחרנית עשר מעלות** once stood in place of the **אם** clause<sup>6</sup>. But it seems much simpler to emend to **הילך**<sup>7</sup>.

2) At v. 11 b the text is again suspicious. a) As it stands, **צל**, which is elsewhere masculine, must be the subject of the feminine verb **יזדה**. b) The phrase, **מעלות אהז**, has every appearance of being a gloss to the preceding **במעלות**. c) B omits the relative clause and Syro-hex abolishes it, though it is retained by A. The exact phrase, **במעלות אשר יזדה**, is found at the end of I. 8 b where **שמש** is the subject, which at times is feminine. Accordingly, Kittel (*Könige*) proposes to delete it and read: *And he caused the shadow to return on the steps of Ahaz backwards ten steps*. On the other hand, the exact phrase, **אשר יזדה מעלות**, also occurs in I. 8, though preceded by **המעלות** instead of **במעלות**, and in accordance with this Dillmann would reject the entire relative clause and read: *And he caused the shadow to return on the steps backward ten steps*. This reading is to be preferred since it has the support of **6**. But there is one drawback to it. The first **במעלות**, which refers to the apparatus and not to the distance, is left undefined. What steps are referred to? But whether just the steps or the steps of Ahaz are read, in either case the sudden introduction of the apparatus to measure the motion of the shadow *at the end of the narrative* is certainly curious. If the first **במעלות** is left standing, it is an allusion to something not in *K.*'s narrative but of which the reader is already aware. But it is possible that the entire phrase, **אשר יזדה מעלות**, is a confusion of the two separate clauses in I. 8 from which it has been taken, and the original text of Kings read: *And he caused the shadow to return backwards ten steps*.

indicated in the **6** text of *K.* where *ἀναβιβασμα*, in the sense of a flight of steps or stairs, varies with *βασμους*, probably to be taken in the sense of steps, meaning degrees (*gradus*).

<sup>6</sup> Stade, Di.

<sup>7</sup> So **6**, Targ., Syr., and Thenius (alternatively), Klost., Kittel, Meinb.

In that case the apparatus would not be mentioned in Kings but only in Isaiah. Text of K. 9 b – 11 would then read:

Shall the shadow go (forward) ten steps or shall it return ten steps? And Hezekiah said: It is a light thing for the shadow to decline ten steps; nay, but the shadow shall return backwards ten steps. And Isaiah the prophet called unto Jahweh and he caused the shadow to return (on the steps?) backwards ten steps.

In this text there is a reference only to the shadow. Its movements are described by the words **הֵלֵךְ**, **נָסָה** and **שׁוּב אַחֲרָיִת**, and **מַעֲלֹת** is regularly taken of the measure of the shadow's motion. But the text is by no means self-explanatory. What is the shadow to which reference is made? What are the steps? The gloss, alone, at v. 11 b tells us. Even if the first **בַּמַּעֲלֹת** is read, the passage is still allusive, though in this case the allusion is expressed rather than implied. The importance of this peculiarity of the probably original text will appear later<sup>9</sup>.

3) The last thing to be noted in K. is the impossible sequence between v. 9 a and 9 b<sup>9</sup>. Since the exact form of K. 9 a is found at I. 7, with the exception of the introductory **]**, it might be thought that K. 9 a was taken from Isaiah, just as the gloss in v. 11 was taken from Isaiah. But the introduction of the gloss from Isaiah in v. 11 is intelligible; it seeks to make good an omission in the present text. The introduction of v. 9 a from Isaiah would be unintelligible, for it creates a needless difficulty with what follows. The significance of this, already pointed out by Stade, will be noticed later.

## II

### THE TEXT OF I. 8

The present text of I. 8 can no more be correct than the present text of K. 9–11.

\* When Thénien conjecturally introduces **שָׁשׁוּ** out of Isaiah as the subject of **יָרָה** and retains the relative clause, he sees what must have approximated to the original text in Isaiah, but he fails to see that the phrasing of the two texts in Isaiah and Kings was originally very distinct. When Klostermann sees in K's account a commentary on I.'s account, he is on the right track, but he fails to draw the proper text-critical inferences. A part of this 'commentary' is due to glossing of K.'s original text.

<sup>9</sup> Thénien failed to observe this, but Stade and Klostermann point it out, and when once seen it is inescapable.

1) In the first place the present position of **שׁוֹמֵר** is stylistically intolerable. 2) In the next place the relationship of the movement of the sun to the movement of the shadow is puzzling. They both seem to go down together. What kind of an apparatus is it on which the shadow goes down as the sun goes down? All sorts of speculations have been indulged in in order to answer this question<sup>10</sup>. But any explanation based on so uncertain a text will be itself doubtful.

3) Again, the phrase, 'shadow of the steps', is a curious one. If it is original, the apparatus is thought of. But where the apparatus is thought of the preposition **בְּ** accompanies it (the shadow *on* the steps). 4) In the present text **לֵב** must again be the subject of the feminine verb **הָיָה**. 5) Finally, v. 8 b is not uniform with v. 8 a. V. 8 a says the shadow would return. V. 8 b says the sun returned. Even if it were more certain than it is that the motions of the shadow and the sun were the same, and that the descent of the one implied the descent of the other, it is not in accordance with ordinary Hebrew usage to have answering clauses so differently worded.

If anything were needed to confirm our suspicions of the present text a glance at the versions would suffice. But fortunately they also furnish us with the clues to a suitable reconstruction.

a) **Ⓞ B N A Q Γ**, Targum, and Arabic read **שׁוֹמֵר הַשֵּׁנִי** for **שׁוֹמֵר** and make it the subject of **הָיָה**<sup>11</sup>. This helps the grammar, but the position of **שׁוֹמֵר הַשֵּׁנִי** as subject of **הָיָה** is still intolerable and further emendation is necessary. Duhm and Eissfeldt delete 'the steps of Abaz', but this is against the textual evidence. **Ⓝ A Q Γ** remove **שׁוֹמֵר** to its proper position immediately after the verb, and this evidence is followed by Marti. But the transposition looks too much like a correction, and against it is

<sup>10</sup> The most likely is that of Knobel, who thinks of a column standing on the top of a rounded elevation surrounded by steps which lead up to the base of the column. The sun going down in the West would cause the shadow of the column to lengthen or go down the steps on the East of the hillock.

<sup>11</sup> This is followed by Olshausen, Di., Duhm, Marti, Cheyne, Mein., Hans Schmidt, and practically by Eissfeldt.

the evidence for the present position of **שמש** in B and the Targum.

I suggest that **שמש** originally stood where **ל** stands now, the latter word having been mistakenly introduced from K. After **ל** had supplanted **שמש**, the true reading was noted on the margin and came from there into the text at the wrong place. It was then emended to **שמש** in order to bring the movement of the sun into relationship to the movement of the shadow. This emendation has the support of a most interesting variant still retained in B. *I will turn back the sun ten steps.* Whether this is a real variant or a very ancient correction, I am not prepared to say. But it is certainly on the right track, for when **שמש** is once substituted for **ל**, the difficulties of the text can at once be cleared up, and the true relationship of K.'s text to I.'s becomes clear.

a) The symmetry which once must have existed between v. 8 a and v. 8 b is now restored (*Behold I will cause the sun to return . . . . . And the sun returned*). b.) The subject of **יהוה** is now unquestionably and properly the sun. c) When 'sun' is once substituted for 'shadow' at v. 8 a, all reference to the movement of the shadow in I. is deleted<sup>12</sup>, and consequently all confusion between the movement of the shadow and the movement of the sun is avoided. d) Finally the singular phrase, 'shadow of the steps', is also avoided, and at the same time another distinction between K.'s text and I.'s text is revealed. If **שמש** once stood where **ל** now stands, it is clear that **מעלות** no longer refers to the apparatus but to the measure of the motion and must be accusative not genitive. The clause would now read: *Behold I will cause the sun to return the steps which it has gone down on the steps of Ahaz backwards ten steps*<sup>13</sup>. I suggest again that the phrase, 'backwards ten steps', is a gloss out of K., and

<sup>12</sup> **ו** incorrectly adds *ו* *and* at the end of the verse.

<sup>13</sup> Knobel and Bredenkamp had already taken **מעלות** as accusative of extent of space and not genitive but clearly incorrectly so long as **ל** was read. Guthe and Marti sought to avoid their difficulty by emending to **הל**. The last step is to substitute **שמש** for **ל** for the reasons given above. I arrived at this solution before I became acquainted with Eissfeldt's similar emendation.



originally the number of steps was mentioned only in v. 8 b.<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, the original text of I. 8 will read as follows:

Behold I will cause the sun to return the steps which it has gone down on the steps of Ahaz; and the sun returned ten steps on the steps on which it had gone down.

When the two texts are thus relieved of the various accretions due to their influence upon each other, their true relationship to each other can be at once seen. K. is dealing with the shadow, I. with the sun. K. speaks of the shadow going (forward) or declining or returning backwards ten steps. I. speaks of the sun going down or returning ten steps, and we are no longer obliged to relate the way in which the motion of the shadow is described to the way in which the motion of the sun is described.<sup>15</sup>

So far as the miracle itself is concerned, there is no difference in principle between the two representations. One is fundamentally as miraculous as the other, as Hitzig long ago observed. But K.'s reference to the shadow is more precise than I.'s reference to the sun. As we have just seen, if the sun's motion is connected with an apparatus for measuring it, this can only be done by the movement of a shadow on the apparatus. The motion which is loosely described in I. as the sun's is more precisely described in K. as the shadow's. In this particular K. would seem to be distinctly secondary, and Klostermann is right in speaking of K. in this connection as

<sup>14</sup> The variant in B reads: *Behold I will cause the sun to return the ten steps which it has gone down.* If this reading be adopted, the phrase, *וְשָׁרְתָה עִשְׂרֵי סֻעֵלוֹת*, becomes even more obviously a gloss. But the fact that *וְשָׁרְתָה עִשְׂרֵי סֻעֵלוֹת* in v. 8 b is without the article, and the fact that the insertion of 'ten' with *הַסֻּעֵלוֹת* in v. 8 a can so easily be accounted for, favor the view that the number of steps was originally unspecified in v. 8 a.

<sup>15</sup> It is true that in I. an apparatus is mentioned upon which the declension of the sun is in some way indicated, and this could, of course, only be done by the movement of a shadow. But the point is that in the corrected text of I. only the apparent motion of the sun is described. It goes down or goes back. The actual movement of the shadow is not described. Above all, it is not stated that the shadow goes down with the sun.

being a kind of commentary upon L. K. is again more precise than I. in reading  $\text{לֶחֶם}$ , with Jahweh as subject. The allusive character of K., which has been already noted, is also best explained by the supposition that it was depending upon a story whose details were well known. "The Steps" in K. are, of course, the well-known steps of Ahaz mentioned in I., as the glossator is careful to remind the reader.

The secondary character of K. is further seen in the alternative which is offered to Hezekiah. Whereas K. 9 a — I. 7 is in entire agreement with I.'s formulation of the sign, it is in violent disagreement with K.'s formulation. But we have already seen that K. 9 a cannot be regarded as a gloss out of I. like the gloss in K. 11. K. 9 must have been a part of the original account of the sign which once stood also in K., and in which no choice was offered to the king. This account has been displaced by the present form of the sign in K. 9 b — 11.<sup>16</sup> The purpose of this modification was not primarily to increase the miraculous character of the sign as Stade supposed,<sup>17</sup> though it possibly does do that to a limited extent, but to suggest a contrast between the pious son Hezekiah, who asks for a sign and accepts one of two alternatives proposed, and the impious father, Ahaz, who refused to make a choice when Isaiah made a similar offer to him of a sign in heaven above or earth beneath.<sup>18</sup>

### III

#### ON THE TEXT AND ORIGINAL POSITION OF

#### K. 7 — I. 21

The Hebrew Text of K. 7, in spite of its position, can only naturally be interpreted as an historical statement. The occurrence of  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  after the imperative  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  makes this clear. The verse cannot be translated: *Take a cake of figs and let them*

<sup>16</sup> The usual view since Stade. Earlier scholars, e. g. Ges., Hitz., De., Brdk., regard I. as a later abbreviated form.

<sup>17</sup> So also Du., Marti, Cheyne, Di.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. 7 10 a.

take and place . . . but only: *Take a cake of figs and they took and placed . . .*<sup>19</sup>

1) But when K. 7 is carefully examined, the question arises whether it is quite complete. Isaiah tells certain persons who are undefined to take a fig-cake, but he does not tell them what to do with it. This can only be inferred from what they did do. They laid it on the boil and the king recovered. This in itself might not be so important, for, though the symmetry of the verse is marred by the omission, it is yet sufficiently intelligible as it stands. But the fact that the remaining textual evidence *makes good the omission* is important, though its significance has been ignored by critics and commentators. **6**, followed by the Syriac, interprets v. 7 as a command and a promise, and not, as **7** does, as a command and a fulfilment. Observe that, on the basis of this interpretation of the text, **וּקַח** is correctly omitted in **6<sup>B</sup>**, though incorrectly supplied again by the incorrect form *ἐλήμφθη* [**וּקַח**], Hoph.!] in A and Syro-hex. **6** also reads **וְקַח** as an imperative in agreement with **וּקַח**. On the other hand, the Syriac supports the Targum's reading **וּקַח** (juss.) in place of **וּקַח** in agreement with the jussives that follow. As the imperative followed by the jussive is in this instance awkward, the Targum and Syriac probably preserve the true reading at this point. The ' of **וּקַח** could easily have dropped out after the preceding י.

The passage would then read: *And Isaiah said, Let them take a cake of figs and lay it on the boil and he will recover.* That the testimony of **6** and Syriac to this form of the text of K. 7 has been so little heeded is probably due to the fact that it was so easy to explain this form as a tendency change made in order to effect a smoother transition to what follows. But that this conception of the text once actually stood in the Hebrew is surprisingly confirmed by the text of I. 21, and it is the significance of this point that commentators, with the exception of Klostermann, have strangely overlooked. In order properly to appreciate it, the difficult problem of the origin and original text of I. 21 must next be considered.

<sup>19</sup> The Targum and Vulgate support the Hebrew, but the Targum supplies the interesting variant, **וּקַח** (jussive), for **וּקַח**.

2) The origin of I. 21 (and 22).

The present position of these verses is, as we have already seen, absurd. But how is it to be accounted for? Three explanations have been offered.

a) I. 21 and 22 originally stood between I. 6 and 7 (= K. 6 and 9), that is, they occupied the same position in I. as their equivalents, K. 7 and 8, occupy in K., and their transposition to their present position was *owing to deliberation*. According to Hitzig, who expounds this theory at length,<sup>20</sup> the editor of I. is revising K., partly in the interest of brevity. In this interest the editor of I. left out the words in K. 5 which refer to Hezekiah's going up to the house of the Lord (cf. I. 5). Therefore he was obliged to leave out at the same time K. 8 which refers to this sentence in K. 5. But when once K. 8 is omitted, K. 7 would come to stand in an unfortunate position between the promise to Hezekiah in K. 6 and its guarantee by the sign in K. 9, in both of which verses Hezekiah is directly addressed, whereas in K. 7 he is not. The deletion of K. 7 would also remove the difficulty that the cure was referred to before the sign was asked or given. The gap thus occasioned between I. 6 and 7 is closed up by the insertion of the  $\dagger$  at the beginning of v. 7. But the editor of I. did not intend to omit the equivalents of K. 7 and 8 altogether, and so he later introduces them into their present position at the end of the narrative.

But if the object of leaving these verses out in the first place was the desire to abbreviate, it is difficult to see why the editor should afterwards put them in again. The theory of a conscious omission and later reintroduction of the verses by the same person is so artificial and improbable that it has been abandoned by practically all subsequent writers.

b) According to a second view, vs. 21 and 22 originally stood between vs. 6 and 7, but were *accidentally* omitted and afterwards added on the margin, from which place they came into their present impossible position in the text.<sup>21</sup> The difficulty

<sup>20</sup> Cf. also Vitrings and Lowth.

<sup>21</sup> So Ges., Thenius, Delitzsch.

with this theory is that no gap is discernible between I. 6 and 7 in which vs. 21 and 22 *in their present form* could be inserted. On the contrary the closest possible connection between vs. 6 and 7 is established by means of the **מ** at the beginning of v. 7.<sup>23</sup>

Both the above theories are based upon the assumption, which was the usual one up to the time of Stade and Klostermann, that L is an abridgment of K., and that the sign was given in the form of the K. text. But we have already seen that this assumption is almost certainly incorrect and in so far as these theories are based on this assumption, they are also exposed to suspicion, even apart from their inherent difficulties. Yet an element of truth may be found in them, as we shall see hereafter.

c) According to the third theory, vs. 21 and 22 are marginal corrections to I. *based upon K.'s text.*<sup>23</sup> It is usually supposed that when the sign was added, K. 7 was omitted from the account as being, in its present position, inconsistent with the sign.<sup>24</sup> In other words the omission of the equivalent of K. 7 was purposed. On the other hand, the omission of the equivalent of K. 8 was not purposed, for, as we have seen, no equivalent of K. 8 ever stood in I. So far as v. 22 is concerned, this theory is undoubtedly correct. V. 22 never could have stood in the original Isaiah text, for it refers to Hezekiah's going up to the house of Jahweh which is found only in K. I. 22 is therefore a patent abbreviation of K. 8; and since K. 8 belongs to the expansion of the earlier Isaiah text, this allusion to K. 8 at I. 22 must belong to the very latest accretions to I.

But the relationship of I. 21 to K. 7 presents a more difficult problem. It has the two variants **וְכֵן** and **וְכֵן**, the latter

<sup>23</sup> According to Gesenius this **ו** was either added by a later copyist in order to close up the gap caused by the omission of vs. 21 and 22, or the original editor may have at first deliberately intended to omit vs. 21 and 22 and therefore added the **ו**. Later, he changed his mind and appended the deleted verses to the margin, from which they found their way by means of later copyists into their present position!

<sup>23</sup> So Knobel, Brdk., Stade, Di., Du., Marti, Che., Eissfeldt.

<sup>24</sup> So Stade, Di., Du., Che.

an *á. λ.*, and above all it has the conception of K. 7 as a command and promise, i. e. jussives are read throughout; and the  $\text{וּפָקַדְתִּי}$  of K., which shows that the last clauses are to be interpreted historically, is omitted. It is commonly supposed that the differences between K. 7 and I. 21 are owing to the same sort of loose quotation from K. as in the case of I. 22. But I raise the question whether this explanation is the probable one.

1) In the first place, the interpretation of the tenses in v. 21 as jussives could not be more unfortunate in the present position of the verse. We would certainly expect at this point the historical tenses found at K. 7. This was so strongly felt by Kamphausen and Guthe (in Kautzsch's translation, first ed.) that, following a hint of Gesenius, they emended I. 21 to the historical tenses in agreement with K. 7. This is such a simple and obvious way out of the difficulty that one wonders why the present form of v. 21 came to be adopted in the first place, since it is absolutely inconsistent with its present position. Further, it is to be noted that I. 21 does not contain any equivalent for K.'s  $\text{וּפָקַדְתִּי}$ ; but it is that form which determines the historical interpretation of the tenses in K. 7 as necessary. The fact that the verb which necessitates the historical interpretation of K. 7 is *omitted* in I. 21 is strong evidence against the proposed pointing of the tenses in I. 21 as historical.

2) In the next place we have seen that  $\text{Ⲅ}$  and Syriac already read jussives at K. 7. *The fact that I. 21, which, ex hypothesi, depends upon K. 7, also reads jussives is the strongest sort of corroboration that the jussive construction was an original element in the text of K. 7 and was not due to a later harmonizing tendency in the Versions.* This does not mean, however, that jussive tenses should be *substituted* for the historical tenses at K. 7. In that case no reference to the fact of the cure would be found in K. Again the presence of  $\text{וּפָקַדְתִּי}$  after  $\text{וּפָקַדְתִּי}$  of the Hebrew or after the preferable reading,  $\text{וּפָקַדְתִּי}$ , of Targum and Syriac prevents the jussive interpretation of the verbs.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Burney (*Notes on Hebrew text of the Books of Kings*) is certainly following a wrong lead when he deletes this exceptionally important  $\text{וּפָקַדְתִּי}$ . He thereby throws away the key to the criticism of the passage.

What the textual evidence very strongly suggests is that *both* the historical and the jussive tenses once stood in K. 7. On this supposition the gap already noticed in K. 7 b would be filled out. The text of K. 7 would then have originally read as follows:

a) And Isaiah said: Let them take a cake of figs and lay it on the boil and he will recover. b) And they took it and laid it on the boil and he recovered.

The almost exact similarity in Hebrew between the two clauses accounts for the omission of one of them. The Hebrew of K. fortunately preserved the second clause. 6 and Syriac of K. and also the Hebrew of I. 21 preserved the other clause.<sup>26</sup> Thus, not the *substitution* of jussives for historical tenses by 6 and Syriac at K. 7 b was intentional, but the *omission* of the entire clause, K. 7 b, may have been, in order to furnish an easier transition to what follows. This omission would be facilitated by the similarity in Hebrew between the conjectured original forms of v. 7 a and v. 7 b.

3) In view of the fact that the narrative, K. 20 1-7, ends appropriately with the historical statement of Hezekiah's cure, the deduction of Stade, which has now become the commonplace of criticism, that the sign is a later accretion to the text becomes irresistible.<sup>27</sup> But with the establishment of the fuller original form of K. 7, it can now be seen how the sign might have become quite easily attached to the preceding narrative. When the clause containing the historical tense dropped out through accident or was purposely deleted, *the clause containing the jussives would furnish*, as has just been noted, *an easy transition to the episode of the sign*. This intermediate

<sup>26</sup> It is interesting to see that Klostermann almost arrived at this view, for he suggests in a tentative way that K. 7 should be read as a command in accordance with 6 and I. 21, but that the historical form, represented by the Hebrew, once stood after K. 11. Meinhold ignores the claims of the jussive interpretation to consideration, but removes the whole of K. 7 to a place after K. 11. Both these scholars thus deprive themselves of the clue to the critical analysis of the passage.

<sup>27</sup> To take K. 7 as anticipative of the final results, (Hitz., De., Che. in *Commentary* but subsequently abandoned in favor of Stade in *Intro.*) can hardly be regarded as probable.

form of the narrative is not now represented in either of our parallel Hebrew accounts. But 6 and Syriac and the Hebrew of I. 21 furnish evidence that it once existed in Kings, and I submit the following evidence, though with some misgivings, that it also once existed in a somewhat modified form in Isaiah.

a) We have seen that I. 21 presents at least one variant,  $\text{וַיִּטְרֹף}$ , which is interesting. At first sight this word, found only here, might seem to claim greater originality than the more colorless word,  $\text{וַיִּטְרֹף}$ , of K.<sup>28</sup> But if I. 21 is, as seems clear, a later accretion to Isaiah, this view is by no means so certain. The technical term may have been due to the glossator's desire to display a little medical terminology. In any case, it is not due simply to carelessness in citation.<sup>29</sup> It is vouched for in 6 of I. 21. We have also seen that *in its present form* I. 21 could not have stood between vs. 6 and 7. But at this point 6 again presents us with an interesting variant whose possible significance has been overlooked. 6 makes v. 21 a direct address to Hezekiah: "*And Isaiah said to Hezekiah, Take [imper. sing.] a cake of figs and rub it ( $\text{וַיִּטְרֹף}$ ) and place it<sup>30</sup> (upon the boil, Syro-hex) and thou shalt recover.*" Now it is not claimed that the Hebrew text which may lie back of 6 represents the original text of K. 7. That text is assured. On the other hand, why the Hebrew text back of 6 of I. 21 should be thus modified *in its present position* is insoluble. The point to remember in dealing with I. 21 is that neither the Hebrew text nor the Greek text can be accounted for in the present position of the verse. It is the recognition of this fact that lies at the basis of the earlier attempts to insert I. 21 between vs. 6 and 7. Both readings are out of all harmony with the position of I. 21 at the end of the narrative. Why should mere looseness in citation take this very peculiar and incomprehensible form? And here it is to be noticed that the direct address to Hezekiah of 6 still further aggravates the difficulties of 6's

<sup>28</sup> So Kno., Meinh.

<sup>29</sup> On the other hand  $\text{וַיִּטְרֹף}$  would seem to be due to carelessness. The textual evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of some form of the verb  $\text{וַיִּטְרֹף}$ , which is also preserved in 6 of I. 21.

<sup>30</sup>  $\text{וַיִּטְרֹף}$  is a conflate.



jussives in the present position. But what has thus far not been observed is that v. 21 in **6**'s form could very easily be fitted in between vs. 6 and 7. I raise the question whether K. 7a, as reconstructed with its jussives, could not have been deliberately reformulated in **6**'s form of L. 21 (K. 7b with its historical tenses being omitted either by accident or intention), in order to form a point of attachment in Isaiah for the later episode of the sign? The Isaiah text would then have read after v. 6:

And Isaiah said to Hezekiah: Take a cake of figs and rub it (on the boil) and thou shalt recover. And this shall be a sign unto thee . . .

On this theory the difference in phrasing of L. 21 in **6** is not due to carelessness in citation but to deliberate purpose and the substitution of **לד** for **לש** may have been intended to impart an air of originality to the reformulation. The present position of L. 21 in the **6** form might then, indeed, be due to a simple accident, in agreement with the second theory of the origin of the verse described above. It was accidentally omitted from between v. 6 and v. 7, then added to the margin, probably opposite v. 6, from which place it found its way into its present position after the interpolation of Hezekiah's hymn. The present Hebrew form of L. 21 may then be regarded as a partial correction of the Hebrew back of **6**'s form of v. 21, a correction based on K. 7a as reconstructed above. That is, the present form of v. 21 in **6** emends the second singular imperatives of **6** to the jussives which once stood in K. 7a, but retains the peculiar **לד** which first appeared in the Hebrew back of L. 21. This theory is admittedly complicated, but so are the phenomena which it undertakes to explain. Its merits are two:

1) It seeks to explain more adequately than has been done the peculiar formulations of L. 21 both in **6** and **6**. We have seen that the Hebrew text in its present form could never have stood between L. 6 and 7. Hence the two theories referred to above which supposed that L. 21 was transferred, either deliberately or through accident, to its present position were temporarily rejected. But the third theory which sought to account for L. 21 simply as a loose reminiscence of K. 7, added

by a later glossator who missed an allusion to the fig poultice, is not satisfactory, either. Why should this looseness in citation result in a form of the verse (the jussives) totally inappropriate to the position assigned to it in Isaiah at the end of the narrative? Why did not the glossator adopt the more appropriate historical form which is found at K. 7 b? The suggestion was made that I. 21 witnesses to a text at K. 7 in which the jussive form once actually appeared. But this in itself does not solve our problem, for if K. 7 once contained both the jussives and the historical tenses in agreement with our reconstruction above, why should the glossator select the least fitting of the two clauses (the jussives) to insert at the end of Isaiah's account? Thus, mere looseness of citation cannot account for I. 21. The citation in its present form and position is not merely loose, it is absurd. Accordingly, an element of truth is to be found in the theories which inferred from the form of v. 21 that it must have originally stood at an earlier point in the narrative. We then turned to the Greek form of I. 21 and discovered that, while the Hebrew form of the verse could never have stood between I. 6 and 7, the Greek form of the verse could do that very thing. The Hebrew back of the Greek form was then considered to be a purposed reformulation of the jussive form which originally stood at K. 7 a, in order to attach to it the account of the sign as now found in Isaiah. This form then became misplaced by accident, found its way into its present position, and was subsequently corrected back into the jussive form of the present Hebrew text of I. 21 on the basis of K. 7 a, but loosely corrected (cf. ~~187~~). Here lies the element of truth in the third theory of the origin of this verse.<sup>31</sup>

2) The second advantage to be gained from the above reconstructions is that they provide an earlier form of the narrative originally ending at K. 7 (the cure of Hezekiah) to which the episode of the sign could easily be later attached.

<sup>31</sup> It should be noted that v. 22 is also clearly a loose citation and also absurd in its present position. But this verse was almost certainly added after v. 21 came to occupy its present position.

To sum up the conclusions of this study: 1) The most original form of the account of Hezekiah's sickness ended with K. 7. 2) The original form of K. 7 read: *And Isaiah said, Let them take a cake of figs and let them lay it upon the boil and he shall recover (v. 7 a jussives). And they took it, and laid it on the boil and he recovered (v. 7 b historical).* 3) This early form of the account was subsequently enlarged by the episode of the sign in L. a) This episode was originally introduced by a clause which was a reformulation of K. 7 a and in which the jussives were changed to the second singular imperative, addressed to Hezekiah: *And Isaiah said to Hezekiah, Take a cake of figs and rub it (on the boil) and thou shalt recover.* (This form is now retained only in 6 of L. 21.) b) This introduction was followed by vs. 7 and 8 in the following form: *And this shall be the sign to thee from Jahweh that Jahweh will do this thing which he hath promised. Behold I will cause the sun to return the (ten?) steps which it has gone down on the steps of Ahaz; and the sun returned ten steps on the steps on which it had gone down.* 4) Still later L. 21 in 6's form was lost by some accident from its original position between L. 6 and 7, and finally found its way back into the text in its present position. 5) In certain manuscripts it was corrected on the basis of K. 7 a back again to jussives, as now represented by the Hebrew of v. 21. 6) Meanwhile, after the loss of L. 21 (6's form) from its original place between L. 6 and 7, the sign of the sun was subjected to the modification of the sign of the shadow now found in K. 9 b-11. This modification was mainly in the interest of establishing a contrast between Hezekiah, the pious son, who asked for a sign, and Ahaz, the impious father, who refused the offer of the sign. The text of K. originally read: *And Hezekiah said unto Isaiah, What is the sign that Jahweh will heal me and that I shall go up on the third day unto the house of Jahweh? And Isaiah said, This shall be the sign to thee from Jahweh that Jahweh will do the thing that he promised—Shall the shadow go (forward) ten steps or shall it return ten steps? And Hezekiah said, It is a light thing for the shadow to decline ten steps, nay, but the shadow shall return backwards ten steps. And Isaiah the prophet*

*called unto Jahweh and he caused the shadow to return (on the steps?) backwards ten steps.* 7) Finally, after I. 21 came into its present position and was corrected on the basis of K. 7a into its present Hebrew form, v. 22 was also added (an abbreviation of K. 8).

It is at once admitted that much of what has just been stated is of a highly speculative nature. But it is believed that it does some sort of justice to all the exegetical and text-critical data. These, on their face, are of the most puzzling description, and probably no absolutely certain solution of the complicated process which is responsible for them will ever be forth-coming. But whatever may be said of the various refinements upon Stade's theory proposed above, the theory itself in its two main features, namely that the episode of the sign was not an original part of the narrative, and that the sign itself went through an expansion in K.'s form as contrasted with I.'s, seems to be established. In that case the passage is one of the most interesting and convincing instances we have in the Old Testament of the growth of a legend. We can see it starting with an historical nucleus and rapidly taking on miraculous character. *The fact, also, that this growth can be observed in one of the Isaiah narratives should put us on our guard when we come to the other and historically far more important narrative of the Sennacherib campaign.*