

quite clearly formulated what exactly he means by the authority of Christ. He has a great many most felicitous utterances on the subject, but, once more to use his own phrase, they have never been 'correlated.' For instance we read, 'It is this which constitutes what we call the authority of Christ, that He constantly confronts us with an obligation which presses down upon us from the Unseen, which will not let us go'; or, again, 'Here lay the basis of all His authority over them (the apostles); that He had done for them what none other could do, by restoring them to the gracious privileges of a full Divine fellowship. Henceforth they were not their own; they had but one aim, to obey the will of God revealed in Him, to make it prevail in their own lives and in the world at large'; or the closing sentence of the book, 'The measure in which we shall comprehend the true authority of Christ will be in proportion as we keep life on all its sides, intellectual as well as moral and spiritual, true to the highest.' Now all that is true, and beautifully put. But what does Dr. Forrest mean by the authority of Christ, say, on God? Does he mean Christ's testimony to the being and nature of God, His revelation of God, which is to be regarded as final and authoritative because it is His? I think he does. Then that is the last word on God. But then it is also a word which grows in content as we are able to understand it. And what is really to be desiderated, but what Dr. Forrest has failed to give us, is such an unfolding of the idea of God, of duty individual and corporate, of the revelation of human destiny, as shall at every point carry the Spirit's attestation of being the proper interpretation of Christ's deliverance. To ask this is not the hankering after a formal instructor which

he rightly reprehends. It is the desire to know what is the hall-mark by which one may decide what carries and what does not carry the authority of Christ. If I am told the authority of Christ is a personal thing, is the outcome of the knowledge of what I owe to Him, I agree; but it is because I want to render to Him that submission and respect which I acknowledge as His due that I wish to be sure of what is His will. If I am told that I must exercise my own enlightened moral and spiritual consciousness in order to arrive at that, where is the authority of Christ? Is it not really resolved into the most solemn decisions of my own judgment?

While frankly pointing out what seem defects in Dr. Forrest's able treatment of his subject, I should leave a quite wrong impression if any one were to think that this is anything else than a strong book. It is a worthy sequel to his earlier work, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, which has deservedly won wide approval. All the best features of the earlier volume reappear here. There is the same sense of where the centre of interest and concern for the cause of Christianity lies, the same illuminating handling of Scripture, and the same recurrence of passages which thrill with reverence and adoration for the Divine subject of his theme that makes the reader remember that he is on holy ground, is dealing with the Saviour of his soul. Dr. Forrest has certainly succeeded in making a valuable contribution to a right understanding of what is involved for God in His gracious act of Incarnation, and he has brought fresh light to bear upon its far-reaching significance by setting it in its proper relation to the work of the Holy Spirit.

---

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR J. V. PRÁŠEK, Ph.D., PRAGUE.

### A New Work on the History of Israel.

It is in accordance with the daily growing interest in the Biblical history of Israel,—an interest which has been intensified by the unexpected discoveries in the department of the Monuments, as well as by the assiduous study of the O.T. literature preserved to us,—that we find ourselves in the happy

position of being able to notice for our readers a new scientific contribution to this department of study. There are few other departments in the wide field of historical science and antiquities which receive more devoted or zealous attention, than just the history of that people who provided the starting-point for what humanly speaking is the most splendid religious system.

In a recent publication, bearing the title *Die Hebräer: Kanaan im Zeitalter der hebräischen Wanderung und hebräischer Staatengründungen* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1906), a previously unknown student of the Monuments, Wilhelm Erbt, has undertaken to relate the history of Israel from its beginnings to its final overthrow under the Hasmonæans. In Erbt we have a student, endowed with an acute mind, thoroughly at home in the departments of Jewish History and Biblical exegesis, devoting himself to the study of the literature. It is a pity that the author's standpoint in Biblical criticism is as exclusive as it could well be. This presupposition compels our inquiry to take note of his postulates and considerably to modify them.

The author takes the same point of view as Hugo. Winckler adopted in his *History of Israel* and other numerous inquiries, according to which the most obstinate negation of the historical tradition, and the most arbitrary interpretation of traditional information, are made use of in favour of a preconceived opinion. This arbitrariness is seen especially where the chronological arrangement of the oldest sources of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, the Jahwist, and the older Elohist comes into question. On the bases of subjective considerations, Erbt dates the Jahwist in the period of Hezekiah, disregards entirely the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, and exerts himself to read a meaning into individual declarations of the Biblical text, which contradicts in the strongest possible way results already secured, and for the most part accepted.

It seems, of course, natural that in the first instance, the period before the Kings, to which a considerable portion of the book is devoted, should be concerned with the postulates of the author. A chronological table annexed to the work contains the respective opinions of Erbt, which, on the whole, must be regarded as conjectures, at the best only fitted to serve the purpose of providing new grounds for the results which they contradict. Erbt begins his exposition with the invasion of Chedorlaomer of Elam. As a result of that, he believes that the Amorites, as the first racial element of the group of Canaanites in Canaan, overthrew the Babylonian rule, which had been founded by Hammurabi, and set up a priestly kingdom, having its seat in Ḥazazon-Tamar, although Gn 14 and the Abdiḥiba letters

mention Salem, *i.e.* Jerusalem, as the seat of this kingdom, which, soon after the overthrow of the heretic king, Amenhotep iv., was reduced by the (Ḥabiri?) Jebusites. The Jakob-el, which is known to us from the Kamak list of Tahutmes III., Erbt, regarding it as an Amorite kingdom, places in the land east of the Jordan, and asserts that it was destroyed by the same Pharaoh, and that the ruins of this small kingdom were taken possession of by the tribe of Gad. The kingdoms of Sihon and Og are therefore to be regarded as parts of this ancient empire. We must here, however, keep in mind the fact, which has been certainly established by Egyptology, that the list of Tahutmes extends undoubtedly only to the land west of the Jordan, and the Jakob-el there in question is to be placed in the neighbourhood of Shechem. The tribe of Gad is supposed, as part of the Ḥabiri, to have gained possession in the country west of the Jordan, and to have secretly supported Amenhotep iv. (Khuenaten) against the plottings of the Egyptian *amilāti* and *hazanāti*. After the reforming work of the heretic king had come to nought, the Gadites west of the Jordan separated themselves from their tribal relatives and became the tribe of Asher. The Gadite tribe east of the Jordan was, according to Erbt, called Israel, but was  $\pm 1250$  B.C. destroyed by Merenptah. Soon after that, the tribe of Reuben pressed forward from the south and set up a 'Reubenite kingdom' east of the Jordan, driving the tribe Dan-Naphtali over the Jordan. Dan takes possession of Shechem, which had long been regarded as the political centre of the land west of Jordan. The united tribe Zebulun-Isachar takes advantage of the confusion in Syria to march against Shechem on their south. Moses' arrival in Kadesh-Barnea is, without any reason whatever, placed in the time  $\pm 1175$  B.C. although the Exodus took place, at the latest, in the time of Seti II.  $\pm 1265$ , and in  $\pm 1175$  the Philistines had already settled on the coast from Dor to Gaza. Joshua, leader of the united tribe Simeon-Levi, is regarded as the bearer of the Mosaic tradition, in spite of the fact that he is represented in all the traditions as an Ephraimite, *i.e.* a descendant of Joseph. Erbt sees in the well-known story of Dinah a reaction of the Shechem alliance against the invasion of Joshua, whereby the tribe of Levi is annihilated, and Simeon is driven into what was later the territory of Benjamin. This, too, is a most arbitrary con-

struction, seeing that the history of the small tribe of Dinah, which was lost far too soon, belongs to the earliest times of the Israelitic invasion of Palestine, at least before their emigration to Egypt. The sacred tree of Shechem was in the Canaanite period the middle point of a religious society, which stood under the protection of the god of covenants, Baal-berith, but it never possessed, so far as our sources allow a judgment, the political and legal signification which, according to Erbt's conjecture, belonged to it. The tribe of Manasseh, the representative of Gideon's kingdom, is, according to Erbt, the first forerunner of the 'Aramaic' Semites in Canaan, which overpowered the Reubenite kingdom, and crossed the Jordan. Abimelech is declared to have been a tyrant of the Shechem alliance,—another groundless conjecture, seeing Manasseh appears in the genealogical tree as a part of the lost tribe of Joseph, and its dispersion to the east and west of the Jordan proves that it had at a date considerably earlier been overtaken by a serious catastrophe, which had as a result the breaking-up of the clan into new tribes and sub-tribes. Abimelech is, however, a son of the Manassite Gideon, who perhaps ruled over Shechem, but at last destroyed it. His fall has absolutely no connexion with the supposed immigration of the tribe of Ephraim. Erbt sees an attempt at immigration in the incursions of the Moabites into the territory of Benjamin and Ephraim, to whom the judge Ehud had acted as leader, and he places the event about 1070 B.C. This conception may be correct, but the fixing of the culminating point of the power of the Philistines west of the Jordan  $\pm$  1050 is undoubtedly incorrect, seeing that the beginning of the high-priesthood of Eli in Shiloh, which is contemporary with the high-water mark of Philistine power, must be dated as early as  $\pm$  1090 B.C. In like manner,

we cannot, with Erbt, explain King Saul as the conqueror of the Shechem alliance, which at a much earlier date had ceased to exist.

Our author is more happy in his appreciation of the conditions produced by David's conquests. The welding together of the Canaanite survivals with the progressive Hebrew spirit is undoubtedly David's historical service, and the spiritual direction aiming at centralization of worship and the deepening of religious views is no less due to him. One cannot, however, agree with Erbt when he asserts that under the influence of Solomon a consolidation of Canaanite tendencies was produced, seeing that he built the imperial temple. The temple in Jerusalem was originally no imperial temple, but a sanctuary for the Jewish royal house, which only gradually gained the predominance over the ancient sanctuaries, and, so far as it has any signification whatever, it demonstrates just the positive decline of the Canaanite influence. The reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah aimed at the removal of all places of worship, high places, and sacred trees which were still of consideration.

In this way the history is construed, but it is neither investigated nor delineated. The extant sources must certainly be carefully weighed, judged, and classified; but it is unscientific to seek to read into them one's own conception of things, and on this slippery, baseless foundation to set up far-reaching conjectures, which in all probability are in the beginning made as pure conjecture in order to be regarded immediately afterwards as the common good of science and to serve as the immovable pillars of a further construction, which hangs in like manner in the air. Erbt's book, in spite of all the diligence and acuteness of its author, is to be regarded rather as a warning example of how scientific investigation can lose its way, than as an enrichment of our knowledge.

## At the Literary Table.

### ENGLISH RATIONALISM.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH RATIONALISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By Alfred William Benn. (*Longmans.* 2 vols. 21s. net.)

SHOULD the historian of Rationalism be himself a Rationalist? What is Rationalism?—it depends

upon that. The historian should be in sympathy with his subject. None but a Mystic can write sympathetically, and therefore truly, of Mysticism. But it does not follow that the historian of French poetry must be both a Frenchman and a poet. What is Rationalism?

'Rationalism,' says Mr. Benn, 'is the mental