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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

PALESTINIAN EXCAVATIONS AND THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL.[1]

IT would be impossible within the limits of a single paper to describe the many valuable discoveries in the course of recent excavations which have thrown such a flood of light upon ancient Palestine. I do not propose, therefore, to describe the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund at Lachish, in the Judaean lowlands, and at Gezer, or the fruitful labours of its friendly rivals at Megiddo, Taanach and Jericho. It is true that relatively little has been undertaken in Palestine compared with the achievements in Egypt, Babylonia or Assyria; but a very considerable amount of evidence has been accumulated, and Palestinian archaeology, one of the youngest of studies, has already stimulated Biblical research in this direction. It must suffice for me to refer to the admirable description of Palestinian archaeology by Père Hugues Vincent; to Dr. Benzinger's new edition of his *Hebräische Archäologie* (which shows at a glance how profoundly this subject has advanced in little more than a decade); to the use which has been made of the archaeological material by Professors Marti, Jeremias and Sellin in their studies of the old religion, and to Professor Kittel's recent investigation of certain important features in religious archaeology.

It is with broad historical outlines that I am more particularly concerned. Palestinian archaeology is in its infancy, and one must distinguish between the indisputable results

[1] Based upon a paper read before the Oriental Congress at Copenhagen, August, 1908.

and those which are more provisional or individual. Making every allowance for the incompleteness of the new study, I propose to notice certain points where the assured results of excavation can be brought into touch with the Biblical history and with external or contemporary sources. There are these three lines of research, and where their paths agree, as they do in one important age, we may conclude that practical certainty has been reached. But should they refuse to converge, and this also happens, we may feel sure that the problems at stake are still far from being simplified. These points of contact and divergence affect our perspective of the history of Israel, if not of Palestine itself.

The first feature in Palestinian archaeology which attracts attention is the *lengthy and gradual development of the culture.* From the earliest ages to the Seleucid period there is no cataclysm, no violent substitution of one culture for another. Everywhere there is an orderly progression marked by certain interesting phases which furnish an approximate chronological guide. It has been ascertained that pottery is an invaluable criterion for the classification of the material, and the distinctive features, first formulated by Professor Petrie at Lachish, have been tested and approved by Messrs. Bliss and Macalister in the Judaean lowlands, and again independently confirmed by Professor Sellin at Taanach. By means of the pottery the culture of Palestine has been divided into periods which have been provisionally dated, thanks to scarabs, cuneiform tablets, Greek and other inscriptions. Thence, with the help of historical evidence, the results have been put into some historical framework, so that archaeologists will sometimes associate this or that discovery with one or other of the events in Palestinian history. Thus, step by step, archaeology has to rely upon other departments of research, quite as technical as itself, and it is obvious that we must not confuse purely archaeological evidence with

those inferences which belong properly to the realm of history. For, after all, archaeology is only one of the many handmaidens of history in its widest sense.

Now, one of the many difficulties with which Palestinian archaeology has to contend is the selection of reliable terms for the different phases of culture. When our evidence belongs to the third century before Christ we may style it Seleucid; when to the ninth, Israelite, and when to the fourteenth, Canaanite, though this will depend upon our date for the Israelite invasion. But Palestinian archaeology can rarely be so precise in its dates. On the other hand, the discovery of cuneiform tablets of the same series as those found at el-Amarna, in combination with other evidence, enables us to recognize what may be called the "Amarna" age. Its culture passes over into that which must obviously be Israelite, since, in due course, there is abundant evidence that we have reached the Seleucid period. But no dividing line can be drawn. The arrival of the Israelites marked neither a revolution nor any abrupt movement progressive or retrograde. There is no sudden change in the pottery, in the sacred places or in the forms of culture. Civilization and religion show no sensible alteration; and if the phases of culture are subdivided into Canaanite and Israelite, it is because after the "Amarna" age the culture falls in a period associated, in the Old Testament, with the occupation of Canaan by Israel and the rise of the Israelite monarchy.

It is often necessary to separate the archaeological evidence from the historical or chronological framework in which it has been placed. This, however, is difficult, as certain adjustments have had to be made from time to time. The introduction of iron, once dated at the Israelite invasion or at the entrance of the Philistines, is now ascribed to about 1000 B.C. Certain characteristic pottery types which had been regarded as pre-Israelite were

subsequently found to extend into the early monarchy. Moreover, at Gezer, Assyrian tablets of the middle of the seventh century were found in strata which had been previously assigned to the early part of the Hebrew monarchy.

All these adjustments of the chronological framework have emphasized one of the most striking results of the excavations: the recognition that the Israelite invasion did not cause that dislocation which would have ensued had the Israelites forcibly taken the place of the Canaanites.[1] The archaeologists are now unanimous that there was no sweeping invasion; only a slow absorption, a gradual process, is the most that the excavations admit. Thus, while external evidence, in turn, ignores any conquest of the invading Israelite tribes, archaeology at last independently supports a view which has been familiar to Biblical scholars for some thirty years.

This agreement in diverse departments of research is so typical of methodical inquiry that where the lines appear to diverge some error of observation or opinion may be confidently assumed. Examples of this have now to be considered.

In spite of many indications of close intercourse between Palestine and Egypt, Palestinian civilization was Asiatic. Egyptian objects can be readily recognized, but the specific origin of the non-Egyptian elements can with difficulty be determined. Although there were relations between Palestine and Babylonia under the First Babylonian dynasty (roughly speaking, about 2000 B.C.), actual imports are few,

[1] In point of fact, a desolated area at Lachish, between the third and fourth cities, once seemed to be due to barbaric tribes, who were naturally identified with Israel; but this view has no longer found justification. Moreover, one skilled excavator who commenced with the belief that the invasion meant an upheaval and break in the continuity, subsequently perceived that there could only have been a gradual settlement.

and several archaeological characteristics (building, seals, figurines) are either not exclusively Babylonian or they are specifically North Syrian.

Intercourse between Palestine and Egypt goes back at least to the Twelfth Egyptian dynasty (also about 2000 B.C.). Excavation, at Gezer at all events, finds little interval for the Hyksos age between the XIIth and XVIIIth dynasties, and in the latter dynasty we enter upon the period when Babylonian supremacy had been broken by the Kassites, and when Palestine was politically influenced by Egypt on the one side and by North Syria and Asia Minor on the other. The position of Palestine would lead us to look to the north for all non-Egyptian influence, and it is precisely there and in the later Hittite empire centring at Boghaz-keui that Babylonian influence continues to be found. Thus, although Palestine archaeology has Babylonian and even Elamite analogies, one must take into account our present scanty knowledge of the archaeology of North Syria, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, and it is possible that any *specific* traces of Babylonian culture which may be found in early Palestine entered indirectly from the north long after the great dynasty of Khammurabi had been overthrown.[1]

As a matter of fact, Professor J. L. Myres has shown that the early pottery development in Palestine is to be associated with North Syria and Cappadocia.[2] This is confirmed by Professor Sayce, and Professor Breasted, in his *History of Egypt* (pp. 188, 262), very naturally connects this feature with the prominence of the northern powers in Palestine. The pottery in general reveals certain well-defined influences or affinities which allow us to divide the archaeological history of Palestine into periods. The earliest indigenous

[1] See *Religion of Ancient Palestine*, pp. 106–113. For a recent statement of the northern ("Hittite") element in Palestinian history at the time of the Amarna Tablets, see Father Dhorme, *Rev. Biblique*, Jan., pp. 61 sqq.

[2] *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, 1903, pp. 367 seq.

culture is followed by a long series of phases : Mycenaean or Aegean, Phoenician, Cypriote, older and later Greek, until we reach the Seleucid age with Rhodian jar-handles, Roman tesserae, etc. Indeed, later comes an Arab ware closely resembling the older painted pottery of ten or more centuries previously. It is rather remarkable that it should be the *Aegean* ware which inaugurates this series. This pottery has been associated with that of Keft or Crete, the Biblical Caphtor, the traditional home of the Philistines. Its introduction has been ascribed to Aegean invasions—to the Philistines themselves; and certainly, noteworthy archaeological phenomena always demand some explanation in the history. But there has sometimes been a failure to distinguish true Aegean ware from that of Cappadocian or northern affinities; and this complicates the problem, because Asia Minor in turn shows some clear traces of Aegean influence from outside. Consequently, only when archaeology has correctly separated Aegean from ordinary Asia Minor pottery, can we ask whether its presence presupposes any dominating historical events. It is to be observed that the specific Aegean ware appears to be of the lower or sub-Mycenaean type ; it comes at the close of the Cretan civilization. Similarly in Cyprus, whose earliest culture-affinities are with Cilicia and Cappadocia, Aegean art appears to reach the island in a mature, not to say decadent stage.[1] Moreover, on the one side, is the fact that the movements in the Aegean basin, especially in the time of Ramses III. (when the Philistines are first mentioned), were accompanied by movements on land from the north. On the other side, neither Egyptian evidence nor the internal situation at the death of Ramses III. proves that any sweeping changes had

[1] J. L. Myres, *Classical Review*, 1896, p. 352. Further research may qualify the above statement, but the meaning of this archaeological feature for the history will still await an explanation.

occurred. If the true Aegean pottery really implies the presence of a new people, it is remarkable that it is only in the pottery that the invaders leave their traces. Besides, we cannot ignore the possibility that Aegean pottery could find its way into Palestine without the aid of Aegean invaders or even traders.

Although the archaeological and historical evidence at present is distinctly incomplete, so far as it goes it does not point to any predominating influences from Babylonia or the Aegean. But the lines converge upon the north, where we have an area fully exposed to those two cultures, and the geographical and political relations between Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia make the north the most natural source of all the culture which was neither indigenous nor Egyptian. The other phases point to the north: Syria, Phoenicia, or to the seaports and their trade with Greece. Even the Arab ware of the Christian period, whose resemblance to the old painted pottery has been mentioned, recalls the theory of the Mesopotamian origin of the Ghassanid culture. Moreover, when, as at Gezer, a unique culture manifested itself, the analogies were with Lydia, Caria and with Cyprus of the early iron age, and iron itself probably entered under the influence of the northern peoples, perhaps about 1000 B.C.

But the external history of this age is obscure. After long rivalries Egypt (under Ramses II.) and the Hittites divided the intervening lands, Palestine and part of Syria falling to the former. Towards the middle of the twelfth century Ramses III. still held Palestine and the sea-trade in the Levant, and imposed the national cult upon Palestine. The sequel to the decay of Egyptian supremacy is unknown. The Hittite empire broke up into a number of small states, and it is curious to find that the name "Hittite" survives to the Assyrian age for the coast-land, including Palestine.

However, in the ninth century the centre of power was still

in the north. The famous coalition which supported Damascus against Shalmaneser for nearly ten years extended from Cilicia to Israel. Damascus had become the controlling factor in the history of the age. Phoenicia, Israel and the South were guided by the fortunes of Damascus against Assyria, and when it fell to Tiglath-pileser IV. Samaria speedily succumbed to Sargon.

The Assyrians were conquerors of the most brutal kind, and wherever they came the whole structure of ancient society was dissolved. By deporting in large numbers the inhabitants of a province and by settling them among strangers, they destroyed the old national or local spirit, and prevented, for a time at least, dangerous insurrections. We can trace the fall of the petty states, the scenes of transportation and importation. Samaria, which contained some 60,000 taxable inhabitants, was partly despoiled by Tiglath-pileser IV., and Sargon carried off nearly 30,000 people when he took the capital. The latter settled new peoples in the land of Ḫatti (Samaria may be included) and in 715 introduced into Israel a number of tribes from the Arabian or Syrian deserts. Judah's unfortunate alliance against Sennacherib was only part of the great unrest in the south; for as the northern states were broken, the south of Palestine came to the front. Judah lost part of its western frontier and the Assyrian king claims 200,000 souls as spoil, and boasts of immense plunder. The external evidence does not furnish the sequel; we need only note, with Professor McCurdy in his History (§ 794), that Sennacherib's apparent leniency to the wasted land was "exceptional and notable." In the seventh century fresh bodies of colonists appear to have been introduced into Samaria by Esarhaddon and Asnapper (Ashurbanipal), and in the reign of the latter we meet with an extensive movement east of the Jordan by which Edom, Moab, Ammon and Hauran were affected. It is not unnatural to compare (with

Winckler) the analogous migration of Israelite tribes and to see in it (with Paton) the beginning of the great overflow from the south which subsequently became more conspicuous. Again external evidence is scanty: only the fact that the Assyrian empire was now rapidly breaking up, partly through internal decay, partly through the Scythian and Babylonian disturbances, indicates that we must not minimize these rather obscure vicissitudes.

Finally, in the sixth century comes the downfall of the Judaean monarchy, with more sweeping changes, and we reach the climax of some 150 years of catastrophe which caused perhaps the profoundest rupture in the entire history of Palestine. A century and a half is little enough in the career of this ancient land and I venture to infer from the evidence which I have rapidly summarized that we must treat it as a monumental epoch. This is no novel conclusion. Not to quote other writers, Robertson Smith, in his *Religion of the Semites*, nearly twenty years ago drew repeated attention to the significance of this age, and he observes that it was as important for religious as well as for civil history (cp. pp. 35, 65, 77 sqq., 358). Peoples were removed from their native soil, the tribal and class organization which had bound them together in their home-lands was dissolved; composed of different elements, some time elapsed before they could assimilate themselves to the older stock among whom they were placed.

The significance of this age can scarcely be realized from the Biblical history; it is also not recognized by Palestinian archaeologists. On the other hand, when we consult their evidence we find that without exception a very marked deterioration of culture makes its appearance in the "Israelite" period. There is a poverty of art, a simplicity of civilization, a distinct decline in the shape and decoration of the pottery; the ugly ware seems to exhibit signs of derivation from skin

prototypes elsewhere associated with desert peoples. Such features have been recognized from the earliest excavations at Lachish nearly twenty years ago. They are beyond dispute, and they are so characteristic that some historical explanation has usually been sought. It is not a new culture, because the old often still survives, but it is a deterioration, and, like the retrogression in Babylonian art after the fall of the First Babylonian dynasty, it is neither normal nor accidental.

We cannot connect this with the entrance of Israel; nothing could be more unanimous than the present recognition of the gradual occupation, the absorption of Canaanite culture, the slow assimilation of the new-comers to their surroundings. But it has more recently been suggested that when the occupation was complete the foundation of the Israelite monarchy inaugurated a new life. Israel, it is supposed, was at last able to show an independent national spirit which was opposed to Canaanite culture. It is urged that this manifested itself in a radical independence of the art, and that Israelite simplicity revealed itself in cult and culture.

Yet this is surely remarkable after the absorption of Canaanite civilization by Israel, and if political changes (viz. the invasion of Israel) do not necessarily affect the general march of civilization, the appearance of this deterioration at the monarchy becomes all the more baffling. Can we reconcile it with the pictures of Israelite luxury in the reigns of Solomon, Ahab, Jeroboam II. or Uzziah, or (in view of intercourse between Israel and Phoenicia) with the beautiful specimens of Phoenician workmanship in Assyria in the eighth century ?

Now this decadence is found in a culture period which has a considerable range, extending as it does from a time somewhere after the Amarna age down to somewhere before the

Seleucid. Further, the effort to connect it with the independence of Israel ignores earlier archaeological conclusions. For, in 1891, Professor Petrie at Lachish had actually assigned the characteristic debased ware to the latter part of the Monarchy (*Tell el-Hesy*, p. 47 seq.). He was followed by Messrs. Bliss and Macalister in the Judaean lowlands, and they pointed out that these types survived the monarchy, and continued into Seleucid times (*Excavations*, pp. 72, 74, 101, 124). The evidence from Taanach is somewhat complicated, and can only be treated technically, but considering the adjustments which have been made since 1902, I have failed to find anything which could be urged against the conclusion that this decadence cannot be placed any earlier than the great catastrophes to which reference has been made. This decadence is so marked that an adequate explanation *must* be found, and it is to be found, not in the earlier history of Israel, but in these later vicissitudes which began in the latter part of the eighth century in Samaria, and culminated in the fall of Judah some one hundred and fifty years later.[1]

These vicissitudes form the great dividing-line between the old order, which the Assyrian conquests destroyed, and the new, which arose as new organizations were developed. In the archaeology we reach the dividing-line between an age which has grown out of the Amarna period and that which passes over into the Seleucid. There is no other division; the changes from Canaanite to Israelite

[1] The deterioration at Taanach begins in a culture which lies immediately below that which includes objects ranging from an Egyptian statuette, probably of the seventh cent., vases which in Cyprus are ascribed to the fifth cent., and embossed lamps apparently of even later date. Of course it would only accord with the actual history if the decadence made its appearance earlier in the north than in the south. The absence of this decadence here and there at Taanach and persistently at Jericho (*Mitteil. d. deutschen Pal.-Vereins*, 1907, p. 65) shows that we have to deal with an irregularly distributed factor, and not with any comprehensive conquest or spread of national simplicity.

are imperceptible, whereas after the appearance of this decadence the culture soon overlaps with the Seleucid.

In the Seleucid culture we find Ptolemaic coins, Rhodian jar-stamps, Jewish ossuaries, and other objects extending into the Christian era. These lie immediately above the culture called Israelite or Jewish. Tell-Sandahannah is an admirable illustration of the overlapping, and at Tell-Judeideh, while the first four feet contained Roman, Rhodian and Seleucid remains, immediately below came the debased Jewish pottery and the jar-handles with Hebrew legends. Those who had classified the two cultures as pre-exilic and post-exilic have since adopted other terms, and although it is recognized that the age of Hellenism brought a new material and intellectual culture, there is no line of demarcation and the transition is normal.

In like manner there is no dividing-line in the contemporary internal history when we work back from the Maccabaean age. Professor Montgomery has recently concluded that "both Judaism and Samaritanism go back to a common foundation in the circumstances of the age of the Exile in the sixth century" (*The Samaritans*, p. 61). This "common foundation" is an irresistible inference, and Professor Kennett had previously contended that the Samaritans would not have accepted the post-exilic priestly law unless they had already accepted Deuteronomy.[1] The mysterious periods after the downfall of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah cannot justly be treated as a blank, although the gaps can only be filled by inference and hypothesis; but when independent arguments lead to similar results, there is reason to hope that a start has been made in the right direction. The historical conditions of the "common foundation" form the new starting-point for inquiry into the centuries that precede and follow.

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1905, p. 174 seq., 1906, p. 498.

Thus, we find that Israelite history involves the following features: the period of Egyptian supremacy, as illustrated by the Amarna letters and the Egyptian evidence. It extends to the age of Ramses III., the first half of the twelfth century. Next come the steps from the entrance of Israel to the independent monarchy, for which we have to rely upon the Biblical sources. Later, the post-monarchical vicissitudes in both Samaria and Judah bring changes in population, dating from the latter half of the eighth century to the sixth. Finally these cannot be severed from the development which, so far as can be inferred, commences at this period and ends in the rivalries of Samaritanism and Judaism.

It is natural to ask how far the conceptions we usually form of the relation between the invading Israelites and the Canaanites may be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the movements in and after the Assyrian age. May we not assume that the later settlers assimilated themselves to their new surroundings, and to the traditions of the land? would they not also view the history of their entrance from their standpoint? Such questions as these do not depend upon individual critical positions: anyone can see how far the Samaritans identified themselves with the history of the past and how far this was historically justifiable.

I have referred to the deterioration in Babylonia in the Kassite period. Now, M. Cuq has shown that under the First Babylonian dynasty private property had been normal, rights had been protected by the State. Later, however, the boundary stones place property under the protection of the gods; society is tribal, cultivable land is collective. The kings and chiefs have their allotted portions, but the individual has only temporary rights, and land can be alienated only with the consent of the group or of the chief. The change is due to the entrance of less civilized tribes,

to whom the decadence in art is to be ascribed; another organization has been planted upon the soil.[1] It is little wonder that a recent reviewer has observed that precisely the same sociological changes were probably produced when Israel took possession of Canaan.[2] But may we not also assume that they could have taken place after the downfall of the monarchies? And this is only one of the questions which arise when we consider post-exilic Palestine and the centuries which immediately precede.

A comprehensive Israelite invasion upon a superior civilization and the later though admittedly obscure movements several centuries afterwards would lead us to expect similar results as regards culture. But Palestinian archaeology has found no decay or change at the entrance of Israel; the deterioration which is so marked as to demand an explanation in the history has long been ascribed to the latter part of the Jewish monarchy; and, if my view is correct, *must* be associated with the vicissitudes of the eighth and following centuries.

The excavations in Palestine have brought many problems, but this conclusion seems certain—the culture which grew out of that of the Amarna age presents a novel decadence and simplicity at a period which is very closely linked with the Greek. The period in question, on historical grounds, *should* be contemporary with the profound changes in Samaria and Judah which extended for over one hundred and fifty years from the latter part of the eighth century. This period, as others have recognized, was as critical for religious as for secular history. As Robertson Smith has observed, the progress of religion and society was much the same in the East and West until the eighth century B.C., when the paths diverge. From

[1] *Nouv. Rev., Hist. de Droit*, 1906, pp. 722 sqq.
[2] *Revue Biblique*, 1907, p. 634.

that time forward the old religion was quite out of touch with the actualities of social life. The old national deities of the small states were powerless. The bond uniting religion and society was broken. The old solidarity of civil and religious life continued to exist only in modified forms. As the national divisions were altered by political changes, religion became detached from local or national connexions; the naturalistic conception of the Godhead and its relations to man entered upon a new stage. The unity of the state and the national citizenship lost their religious significance, and, as Professor Marti (*Religion of Israel*, p. 173) has remarked, individualism and universalism took the place of nationalism in religion. Professor McCurdy agrees that the Assyrian age suggested to many petty communities wider and more comprehensive ideas of civil government and the destinies of nations (§ 291). The late Professor Davidson has said that the idea of the world was now suggested to prophetic thought (*Prophecy*, p. 72), and Professor Goodspeed refers to the age as a preparation for the next onward movement in the world's history (*History*, p. 330).

It is unnecessary, perhaps, to enlarge upon the profound advances in thought which apparently reached maturity in those obscure vicissitudes when the old order was replaced by the new, and a novel simplicity shows itself in material culture. I need only mention in passing that the old idea of corporate responsibility which regarded the family as the legislative unit, gave way to the recognition of individual responsibility. This was a development, in which the book of Deuteronomy occupies a transitional place, and, indeed, the period to which we are brought may be called roughly the Deuteronomic period.[1]

[1] The influence of political circumstances (the breaking up of national life) upon this development is also recognized after the fall of Jerusalem;

The historical background to these great landmarks scarcely shows itself in the written records of Israel. The compiler of the Deuteronomic book of Kings takes little interest in the north after the fall of Samaria and the northern tribes. The Chronicler had access to earlier sources and traditions, but ignores material in Kings and Jeremiah for the sixth century. In each case the writers are influenced by specific historical views which are at least somewhat artificial.

When we turn, however, to the elaborate accounts of the entrance of all the tribes of Israel, we are confronted with the very serious difficulty of tracing the history from the Canaanite pantheon in the days of Egyptian supremacy to the Israelite monarchy and national God. Historical criticism and the excavations compel us to treat as ideal the widespread and successful conquests of the Israelite tribes under Joshua. They show that the people did not come into forcible possession of the great and goodly cities which they had not built, or the vineyards and oliveyards which they had not planted (Deut. vi. 10, vii. 20; Josh. xxiv. 12 seq.). They agree that the impressive lists of the dispossessed nations are rhetorical rather than historical, and this must also be said of the "hornet" sent to aid in the work of extermination. Indeed, if we accept, with archaeologists and Biblical critics, the gradual occupation of Canaan, it is astonishing how much must be treated as ideal, whereas the general scheme of the Deuteronomic writers or compilers includes details which *could* apply to the more recent events in and after the Assyrian age. (Comp. already Steuernagel's hint, *Theolog. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1909, p. 12, on Deut. xxiii. 7.)

Now, from the results of literary criticism we may dis-

see Dr. J. Skinner, *Ezekiel*, p. 143; Dr. W. H. Bennett, *Post-exilic Prophets*, p. 32.

tinguish three leading recensions of Israelite history. First, the Deuteronomic compilation, introduced by the book of Deuteronomy and extending from Joshua to the end of Kings. Second, the priestly, from Genesis to the end of Joshua, with traces in the remaining books; and third, the history in Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, which at one stage formed a single work. There are, of course, numerous problems of greater or less importance, but they do not affect the conclusion that our *earliest* continuous historical work is due to Deuteronomic compilers, at a time when the old life was being replaced—if it had not already been replaced—by the new.

So, on the one hand, we find at the present day strenuous endeavours to reconstruct the early history of Israel. Attempts are made to determine what the Israelites brought; it is seldom asked, what had the Canaanites to give? Opinions vary as to what Israelite tribes entered Palestine, and under what circumstances; but it is rare that attention is directed to those traditions which are ignorant of a Descent into Egypt and an Exodus. Yet there is evidence for an elaborate Canaanite religion of a not ignoble kind, and many critics recognize in one form or another indigenous tradition distinct from that brought in by immigrants. And, on the other hand, while the excavations do not recognize the early Israelite movement, they point decisively to some widespread changes in and after the Assyrian age—to vicissitudes upon which the external sources throw invaluable though scanty light. We are directed to a period which is distinguished by landmarks in the archaeological, the religious and the social development: a period which culminates in the Deuteronomic history, our *first* consecutive source for the history of the past. Thus, the diverse lines of research combine to point to one and the same age, which, I venture to suggest, gives us a new starting-point

for the historical study of many of the problems of the Old Testament and the history of Israel.[1]

STANLEY A. COOK.

THE POSITIVE ELEMENTS IN THE CONCEPTION OF SIN.

II.

In my former article I pleaded for the adoption of such content for the concept of sin as should make the term "sin" exactly correlative and coextensive with that of "guilt." I did so on the strength of the overwhelmingly important difference that exists between contraventions of objective moral law that are unavoidable or unintentional or are occasioned in innocent ignorance, and transgressions that are known beforehand by an agent to be transgressions and are consequently intentional violations of conscience and of recognized ethical sanctions. In reply to the objection that this restriction is sometimes out of harmony with Christian experience, i.e., with alleged deliverances of the Christian consciousness, I argued that such deliverances often have the appearance of expressions of immediate moral intuitions, beyond which it is impossible to go, whereas in reality they embody complex processes of thought involving false

[1] To this division between the earlier history of Palestine and the growth of the Old Testament into its present form I have already alluded in the *English Hist. Review*, 1908, p. 326 seq., and *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1908, p. 629 seq. It is not necessary at this stage to notice its bearing upon the criticism of the pre-Deut. literature or upon the date of Deuteronomy itself (see *J.Q.R.*, 1907, July, pp. 815–818, Oct., pp. 158–164); but it will perhaps justify the negative conclusions which I reached independently in *Critical Notes on O. T. History*. In general, it seems probable that a consideration of the situation in Palestine, during these prolonged political vicissitudes in the north and south, will explain the difference between the actual conditions revealed in the Old Testament account of the earlier history and those which external evidence has led scholars to anticipate, if not to reconstruct.