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

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

not as mere phenomena of nature. The root of the whole difficulty, as Professor Lake frankly admits, is the naturalistic assumption that the reanimation of a dead body—even of the body of the Son of God—could not take place.[1] Anything, he says, rather than that.[2] Hence the need of resorting to the fantastic theories just described, which yet, as seen, have an element of the supernatural inhering in them.

Visional and apparitional theories being parted with, there is only one remaining explanation, viz., *that the Resurrection really took place.* As Beyschlag truly says: "The *faith* of the disciples in the Resurrection of Jesus, which no one denies, cannot have originated, and cannot be explained otherwise than through the fact of the Resurrection, through the fact in its full, objective, supernatural sense, as hitherto understood."[3] So long as this is contested the Resurrection remains a problem which rival attempts at explanation only leaves in deeper darkness.

JAMES ORR.

"HAVE THE HEBREWS BEEN NOMADS?"

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR EERDMANS.

IN the EXPOSITOR for August Professor Eerdmans, of Leiden, after stating that "it is generally received that the Israelitic nation is the offspring of Nomad tribes," affirms that "however common this view may be, a careful study of Genesis and of oriental life proves it to be wrong. Scholars have not paid sufficient attention to some texts in Genesis and to the differences between the various kinds of popula-

[1] *Ut supra*, pp. 264–5, 268–9.

[2] "Such a phenomenon is in itself so improbable that any alternative is preferable to its assertion" (p. 267).

[3] *Leben Jesu*, i. p. 440.

tion in Palestine and North Arabia" (pp. 118 f.). He proceeds to describe (after Musil) the three classes into which he divides this population; *first*, "the Beduins, the proper nomads," "travelling all the year round in a wide circuit, their 'dira,'" wholly dependent on their herds, and without agriculture; *second*, "the people living in towns" by agriculture, trade and commerce, "afraid of the Beduins," and despised by them; *third*, "the semi-nomadic class," some with goats and sheep, which must drink at least every second day, "so they can only live near water and need a better soil than the Beduins do; "they cannot so easily move as the Beduins, who keep camels," "they like to cultivate a piece of land." Others, "called by Musil 'Halb-Fellahin,' are more like the townspeople"; they cultivate fields wherever they have an opportunity. They live in hamlets of tents, and if they are able to stay for several years they live in houses, which they build in the neighbourhood of wells and springs . . . they possess cattle and their flocks pasture in the desert. . . . The difference between these people and the Beduins is obvious. The Beduin's home is where the flocks are pasturing. They carry with them all they possess, and they have only to load their camels and asses if they wish to move. The semi-nomads are people accustomed to a settled life. In the estimation of the Beduins they are not much better than the townspeople" (pp. 120 f.).

"If we examine the narratives about the patriarchs we see that they are semi-nomads (Halb-Fellahin)" (p. 121). Dr. Eerdmans proceeds to quote a number of the narratives in Genesis to show that the patriarchs "do not live in the desert, but in the valleys of Palestine"; that "they are not constantly moving, but remain for several years in the same place. They have cows and oxen; the nomads of the desert only possess camels, sheep, goats and asses;

cattle cannot be kept for want of pasture." Moreover the patriarchs cultivate land.

I.

Before dealing with Professor Eerdmans' views of the patriarchs and his criticisms of the nomadic theory of the origins of Israel, it is necessary to say something about his description of the various classes of the present population of Arabia and Palestine, and about his charge that modern scholarship has paid too little respect to the gradations of settlement between the pure nomads and the townspeople.

However grateful Old Testament scholars may be to Dr. Eerdmans for definitely raising the general question, they will receive with some surprise his implication that his paper provides the first full appreciation of the existence of semi-nomads, and his assertion that they have "not paid sufficient attention to the differences between the various kinds of population in Palestine" (p. 119). I write this far from books, and can give only a few exact references. But it is well known that in dealing with, for example, the Hivites, the Perizzites and the Ḥawwoth Ja'îr, archaeologists, historians and commentators alike for a long time back have indicated economic stages intermediate between the pure nomad and the inhabitants of walled towns.[1] To the students of Professor A. B. Davidson and Professor Robertson Smith the fact has been, since their student-days, a commonplace of the early history of Israel. In recent Old Testament literature, illustrations of the same have been frequent, some of them, I am sure, in writings of those scholars whom Dr. Eerdmans names; while the constant process of transition from the nomad to the peasant life,

[1] This fact, of course, is independent of the question whether some have been right in maintaining that the names Hivites and Perizzites designate elements of the population on these intermediate stages.

which is caused by the close relations of the desert to the fertile soil on the borders of Arabia and within Palestine itself, has been traced—with modern illustrations of the intermediate stages—even more clearly than by Dr. Eerdmans himself. Take, for instance, the valuable articles in the supplementary volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* on "The Races of the Old Testament," and on "The Semites." In the former Professor Jastrow speaks definitely (if I mistake not) of the "semi-nomadic habits" of the Hebrews; and contrasts their successful progress to a state of culture with the arrested development of some of their neighbours and with the reversion of others to lower stages of culture. In the second of those articles, Professor McCurdy affirms the long residence of the Semitic ancestors of Israel not only in the desert but on the oases of Arabia and in Babylonia, where they first practised agriculture. In his article on "The Religion of Israel" in the same volume Professor Kautzsch emphasizes the slowness of Israel's transition from a nomadic to an agricultural stage of life, and speaks of the mingling or overlapping of these stages which is illustrated in the narratives of the Book of Judges and in the laws of the so-called "Book of the Covenant," Exodus xxi.–xxiii. Similarly Dr. Emery Barnes, in the beginning of his article "Israel" in the second volume of Hastings' *Dictionary*. Various other articles in the same work and in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* also touch, to my recollection, on those well-known facts of the economic development of the tribes of the Old Testament; while modern instances of the transition, encountered beyond Jordan, in Edom or in the desert of Judaea, have been noted by Burckhardt, Conder (especially in his *Tent-Work in Palestine*), Doughty (when he is writing of "a kind of nomad peasantry" in Edom), Libby and Hoskins on *The Jordan Valley and Petra*), and by many others in various numbers

of the *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund; and the *Zeitschrift* and the *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten* of the German Palästina-Verein. One might mention also the evidence from the age of the Crusaders furnished by the registers and cartularies of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, and the summaries of these in the works of Prütz, Rey, Röhricht and others. Nor have such materials been neglected by either the commentators of the Old Testament or the historians of Israel. As the exact citations are naturally within my memory, I may be permitted to refer to chapter i., section 1, and chapter iii., section 2, of my *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (1894), and to Book ii. chapter ii. of *Jerusalem* (1907), where the stages of economic advance from the purely nomadic life of the desert, through various half-settled forms of society, to agriculture, civic institutions and an elaborate commerce are fully described, with instances both from the Old Testament, and from observations by myself and others of the habits of the present population. These references (and they could be multiplied) are enough to prove the groundlessness of Dr. Eerdmans' charge of neglect against modern scholars.

But again, Dr. Eerdmans' own description might have been at once more accurate and more full. On p. 121 (of this volume) he gives as one of the distinctions between the Bedouin (rather the Bedu) and the semi-nomads this curious remark, that "the goats and sheep must drink every day, or at least every second day; so they [i.e., the semi-nomads] can only live near water and need a better soil than the Beduins (*sic*) do." Have, then, the latter no sheep and goats which "must drink at least every second day"? Dr. Eerdmans answers this question himself on the very next page, where he says, "The nomads of the desert only possess camels, *sheep, goats* and asses." He denies to them oxen and cows; and, on the other hand, affirms that the semi-

nomads "cannot so easily move as the Beduins who keep camels." But on the border of the Arabian desert I have seen oxen with tribes otherwise purely nomadic; and I have frequently found camels among tribes whom Dr. Eerdmans would call semi-nomadic because they practised agriculture. The camels, of course, are not so numerous nor so fine, as with the pure nomads; but they are there. It is, therefore, inaccurate to describe the possession of camels as one of the distinctive marks of the purely nomadic stage.

The truth is that Dr. Eerdmans' division, in spite of his differentiation of two classes among the semi-nomads, is insufficient. He gives adequate impression neither of the constant processes of transition from the purely nomadic life onwards, with its reversions or backcasts, nor of the variety and complexity of the intermediate stages. To-day hardly one of the various elements of life, the predominance of which over others distinctively marks a particular stage, is not in some degree shared by the rest of the stages. In other words, the distinctions among the various steps in the development are seldom absolute. They consist not so much in the complete absence of any of the distinguishing habits of life as in the varying proportions in which nearly all these habits appear upon every stage.

A complete picture of the economic developments, which take place between the desert and the fertile soil, is therefore an almost impossible achievement. But it would cover at least the following phases. We may take first those pure nomads, who either because of the weakness of their tribe or the strength of the government of the settled districts, never leave their desert homes, except for occasional robberies upon their more settled neighbours, or for fitful barter with them, giving skins, butter, reeds, firewood, alkali, and sometimes salt, for corn, pottery and cloth. Such tribes live largely by hunting, and own but few camels, sheep,

goats and asses. They are of very different grades of poverty, which are determined by the quality of the water-sources and the amount of pasture upon their respective "diras." In the wild Azâzimeh country south of the Negeb most of them possess but few clothes or other property. Some go often for months without bread. Yet even these are not absolutely unfamiliar with agriculture, but will sometimes cultivate a little barley or wheat, either on a small oasis in the desert or where war, pestilence, or drought has cleared of their owners some fields on the borders of the fertile territory. Where cereal crops are not possible they will plant vegetables, and some have a few fruit-trees on their small and secluded oases. Then there are the more powerful tribes of pure nomads[1] who invade the fertile lands periodically (when the government of these is weak enough to allow them), but without the intention or the purpose of permanently settling upon them. In early summer they drive their flocks and camels into Gilead, as in 1891 I found the Ruwala doing; or even, by the highway of the valley from Bethshan to Jezreel, upon the plain of Esdraelon, as the Midianites did in Gideon's time, and as Colonel Conder found the Ṣkhûr doing in the seventies of last century. They levy blackmail of the peasants, sometimes in connivance with the Imperial authorities, as I saw near Irbid in 1891 in sight of a Turkish kaimakam with a small garrison. In the seventies of last century Colonel Conder found the Ṣkhûr exacting blackmail from the villages on Esdraelon. They do not themselves settle to agriculture, but sometimes they take forcible possession of border-lands and have these cultivated for them by fellahin as Ṣkhûr do to-day (on lands in Moab formerly cultivated by the 'Adwân); contracting with peasants from even so far as Nablus, or as others do

[1] The nomads call themselves Bedu, but the peasantry call them Arabs.

farther south in Moab with peasants from Hebron.[1] The cows and bullocks, which are sometimes found with such tribes, are mostly the booty of their recent raids, and I cannot affirm from my own knowledge that they ever breed them; but the possibility of their keeping a small herd of large cattle will not be denied by those who have visited their watering-places in the pure desert. All such things they do without ceasing to be nomads pure and simple upon their own "dira" or range of desert. Occasionally, as Colonel Conder has noticed, they arrange to protect the flocks of the fellahin on the desert pastures.[2] They abstain from further approaches to civilization either because of their traditions or their love of the free life of the desert, or because the government is strong enough to prevent their permanent settlement in the fertile country. But they are continually drawn to the latter by hope of spoil or by hunger. How jealously they prize their slight contacts with fertility is seen by their risings whenever these contacts are impaired or threatened by the government. Even such tribes, then, we feel to be in the beginnings of transition; and we may confidently use their still nomadic character to illustrate the earlier history of tribes now settled in Palestine, who originally came up from Arabia.

In the close neighbourhood of the desert, there are tribes of a purely desert origin, to whom the opportunity has arrived of a settled position within the borders of the arable land, either as mercenaries of the government, or as more independent proprietors and even cultivators of the soil. In the first Christian century the Beni Jafn, who were said to have migrated all the way from Yemen, were enlisted by the Romans as wardens of the Imperial frontier. In time

[1] So Musil; see above, p. 149, n. 4.

[2] He adds (in *Tent-Work*) that there are even lands in the desert belonging to the fellahin.

either they or others established a semi-independent régime, with castles and palaces, built in imitation of the structure of their old Bedawee tents. Nine or ten generations back the 'Adwân (according to their own report) came out of Arabia upon northern Moab, and doubtless at first lived by black-mailing the peasantry, but at last submitted to the Government, from whom they accepted a subsidy, took to agriculture, and now cultivate wheat and barley on the same fields year after year. They have built barns for their corn; and either have repaired ancient towers or constructed new ones for the protection of their goods. But they continue to live in tents. They give you not only milk and "leben," but *pottage of lentils* and *bread* with various vegetables and even vine-leaves. They have camels, and also some cattle; certain families of the Ḥamâydeh Arabs, the next tribe to the south, in the district of Moab called el-Jebâl, keep small herds of cows and bullocks, and in the district el-Kûra others of the same tribe have, like the 'Adwân, fine wheat fields.

The agriculture of tribes at this stage of development may be partly done for them by slaves, and sometimes they are assisted by fellahin engaged for the purpose, but one cannot say that the tribesmen (who call themselves Bedu and are recognized as Arabs by the peasantry) never themselves engage in cultivation. How families or small septs among them pass over entirely to agriculture and settlement in stone houses may be seen by the case I have reported from 'Arâḳ el-Emîr,[1] where a Bedawee family, after two generations of tilling the soil and tent-dwelling, with a third of tent-dwelling only in summer, are at last in the fourth generation settling down permanently in a house of stone. Herr Musil describes fellahin in Edom who cultivate vegetables, vines and olives, and build storehouses, but almost always live in tents. For an untold number of years the

[1] *Jerusalem*, i. 286.

Christians of Kerak spent the winter in their houses in that town, but every summer formed camps for agriculture and the pasturing of their flocks. Recently many of them have taken to rebuilding some of the ruined sites of Moab as their permanent residences, winter and summer alike. It is thus that in certain political conditions fresh villages are formed or deserted ones reoccupied by nomads, it may be after centuries of desolation. Their inhabitants, though more than half-fellahin, do not abandon all the habits of their nomadic ancestors, but (as I have already quoted from Colonel Conder) will drive their flocks far into the desert, and even travel considerable distances at different seasons in order to sow lands which nobody else has claimed and reap the harvests of their own toil or, for payment, also the harvests of others. Sometimes a community of half-fellahin, loosely bound as yet to their difficult soil or oppressed by their neighbours, will move *en masse*, sometimes as far as from Egypt to the borders of Palestine, to more fertile or more free soils. Pestilence, war and drought are also with them not infrequent causes of migration.

These movements from the desert inwards and along the frontiers of the fertile land are met by others from the centre of the latter. The increasing strength of the government of the country enables it to plant in those freshly settled villages a local authority with a small garrison. A government-house is erected and the village is on the way to become a town, with a street or streets and a bazaar. This has happened, within my own experience, at such places as el-Merkez in Ḥauran and Mâdaba in Moab; while Herr Musil tells us that Bîr es-Seba' grows from day to day; instead of tents solid houses of stone are being built, a fine street is already formed, gardens are laid out and trees planted.

By all these and many smaller and less discernible stages the pure nomads of the desert become semi-nomads and the

semi-nomads fellahin. But the forward movement is not always constant. There are arrests and even reversions. Through the fertile land and among the villages small tribes move to-day, who are tent-dwellers and pure nomads and who never have been nor apparently ever will be anything else. It was the same under the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. And the Ta'amirah Arabs in the wilderness of Judaea are said to be the descendants of fellahin who have reverted to the desert and its life in tents.

Moreover, we must take into account the possibility of what does not happen to-day but has happened more than once in the history of Palestine apart from Israel: the forcible and rapid conquest of the whole fertile territory by armed hosts coming out of Arabia. When, as in the case of the first Moslem conquest, the whole territory is seized by warriors, whose nomadic origin is indisputable, the native cultivators become their actual serfs or continue to till their lands on conditions of rent and taxation hardly distinguishable from serfdom.

The various classes of population thus described are, in spite of their fear or contempt for each other, thrown into the closest relations by the processes of commerce and blackmail, rent and subsidy which we have indicated. The covenant of blood is contracted even between tribes at different stages of the evolution; and its artificial bond may lead, under the pressure of circumstances, to a more thorough union. On the lines of the great routes across the deserts treaties are necessary between tribes commanding their principal stages, if a long commerce is to be possible and if the tribes are to make gain by it; we know how before the unification of Arabia in Islam this through-traffic had already effected among certain clans not only a political but a religious union, with Mecca as its centre. Probably Sinai was another such point of concentration. Even the usual name

for blackmail, "Khuwweh" or "Brotherhood," indicates that at one time it implied a close social union. And we know how much *connubium* as well as commerce existed between Judah and the Canaanites.

About one other class of the nomad population it is necessary to say a few words in qualification of Professor Eerdmans' description. Combating the theory of Stade, he denies that the Kenites were nomads (p. 128). "The word Cain means 'smith' and Cain is the father of the Kenites. All the workmen and tradespeople are originally dwelling in towns and oases. Some of them are travelling in order to earn their living by working for the Beduins. The Sonna and Solubba of the present time are in exactly the same condition as the Kenites" (p. 129). But the Kenites, as we shall see, are represented in the Old Testament narratives as nomads, tent-dwellers, associated with the Midianites and familiar with the desert. And similarly the families of travelling tinsmiths, whom one meets to-day on the desert-borders east of Palestine, are the most nomadic of nomads, having no connexion with the towns except for an occasional visit to their markets, and possessing no fields or oases, and extremely little movable property. The settled weapon-smiths of ancient Egypt did travel among the Bedu of the desert to sell their wares; but they were quite a different class from the nomad clans of tinsmiths and coppersmiths who are native to the desert.

II.

There are many obscurities in the early history of Israel and in their traditions of the still earlier individuals and tribes from whom the nation had descended. But all scholars agree, and have long been agreed, that part of Israel's evolution into the agricultural economy which we find them following in Palestine consisted in the semi-nomadic stage.

Traces of this throughout the Old Testament have been frequently recognized by modern scholars (as I have shown above), and on a wider range than that on which Professor Eerdmans has exhibited it. The narratives clearly distinguish between Abraham's and still more Isaac's and Jacob's, manner of life on the one hand and that of the hunting Ishmael on the other. But how far the patriarchs had advanced through the various steps of the semi-nomadic stage, or how near they remained to the more primitive condition of pure nomads is a very difficult question. To prove his thesis that they had already achieved many steps towards a settled life, Professor Eerdmans adduces from the narratives a large amount of relevant evidence; though I would hardly count among this his emphasis on the use of the verb *yashab* of Abraham's different residences; or that of *bêth* for Isaac's dwelling; or even the statements (very few) about Abraham's possessing oxen, for, as we have seen, tribes which are in other respects pure nomads may possess these. As to the agriculture, so frequently imputed to the patriarchs, we have to ask whether they practised it as the desert Ṣkhûr do to-day by employing fellahin to work it for them; or as more settled tribes do by their slaves, or as still more settled tribes do by their own labours. On the other side of the question, there is the ease with which Abraham and Jacob move about over vast tracts of country, the story of Abraham's purchase of the burial place of Machpelah, Joseph's statement to Pharaoh that his family were only shepherds (Dr. Eerdmans' explanation of which, pp. 124 f., I do not feel to be satisfactory), and the fact that the Israelites during their long residence on the borders of Egypt were not at all influenced by the Egyptian civilization. Even if Dr. Eerdmans' appreciation of the evidence of the narratives were to be accepted, namely that they imply the most advanced steps of the semi-nomadic stage, the ques-

tion has still to be faced, whether these features of the narrative are not (as Professor Robertson Smith and the other scholars whom he names have maintained) reflections from the monarchical period of Israel's history, when, according to them, the traditions of the patriarchs and "The Book of the Covenant" received their literary form, whatsoever more ancient elements they may embody. This was Professor Robertson Smith's answer to the first volume of Renan's *History of the People of Israel*, and it has been given also by Wellhausen and by Kautzsch and others in the articles referred to above.

Nothing is really decided by Dr. Eerdmans' appeal to the traditions associating Abraham and Terah with *the land of the nativity* of Terah's son Haran. For Ur Kasdim lay on the borders of the fertile country at the entry of the great roads and lines of migration thither from the centre of Arabia, the first home and probably the cradle of the Semitic race. It is probable that the clan which Abraham represents were part of the second great Semitic invasion of Babylonia, which archaeologists call the Canaanite; and possible that they had never fully settled in Mesopotamia nor abandoned all the Arabian habits of life. Certainly to say, as Dr. Eerdmans does (p. 125), that Abraham's family belonged to "the townspeople" is to say what cannot be proved. No one, who is familiar with the social revolutions in Syria and Palestine caused by political and military movements, would assert that the reversion of Semitic townspeople to a semi-nomadic stage of culture was impossible. But the very infrequent reversions of even fellahin to this stage leaves the balance of probability with the theory that the family of Abraham were not townspeople but had never risen beyond, at the highest, the semi-nomadic stage. And behind this, the constant history of migrations from Arabia into the fertile territories of Babylonia and Palestine teaches

us to infer for them a previous purely nomadic stage.

In all this, however, we are moving largely in the realm of conjecture. We are only a little better off when we come to the narratives of the settlement of Palestine by the tribes of Israel after their wanderings through the wilderness. But the traditions here are clear enough to let us see that in all probability every one of the gradual processes we have seen at work to-day were experienced by some or other of the twelve clans, whether they settled in Moab and Gilead, or came into Western Palestine across Jordan, or moved up there from the Negeb. The tradition is too well established for doubt, that some of them at least succeeded to a rich and elaborate agriculture and civilization, of which they were not the gradual authors, and that the peoples they conquered became their serfs; just as happened in the case of the first Moslem conquest of Palestine. Others, no doubt, drifted in more gradually as Arabian tribes have done within the memory of the living generation; they occupied only the fields and could not take at least the stronger towns of the Canaanites till a long subsequent period of the history. They remained for centuries shepherds and agriculturists. Others did not rise beyond the shepherd and tent-dwelling stage, the desert which lies to the east of the Dead Sea giving them the opportunity of perpetuating their primitive modes of life; again just what happens in the case of some tribes to-day. But among all these classes and between them and the Canaanites there existed the same close intercourse as we have pictured among the modern inhabitants of the borders of Palestine and Arabia: trade and barter, blood-covenants, similarities of ritual, "blackmail" and other forms of the protection of the weaker by the stronger tribes; and in addition (as some of the narratives plainly show) intermarriage. It has always struck me as a proof of the unity which is imputed by the

traditions to the tribes of Israel on their exit from the desert, that the Moabites, so akin to them in blood, in language and in social position, nevertheless never entered the sacred commonwealth, but remained distinct from Israel from first to last. The story of how such a unity was broken up for a time after the invasion of western Palestine is also natural and credible to any one who is familiar with the broken character of the country and the diverse nature of its soils, all the way from desert to garden land, and who is mindful of how a nation might easily preserve its unity and its loyalty to the secret of that unity, faith in the one national God, so long as it still remained in desert territory, but as easily dissipate its faith and its unity among the many local deities and the luxurious temptations of fertile Palestine. Hence, till the Exile, and even beyond it, the persistence in Israel of the same economic differences which we have at the present day; the same struggle between the consequently varying ideals of life and duty.

But—and this is the strongest part of the case against Professor Eerdmans' theory—Israel never forgot that behind all the intermediate stages through which they passed before their establishment in the agriculture of Palestine and the development of their civic institutions, there had been a purely nomadic stage of life: without agriculture, or the finest of the wheat or oil or the grape or the wealth of cattle. It is here that we perceive the inadequacy of limiting the evidence, as Dr. Eerdmans does, to the narratives in Genesis. The memories of Israel's condition before they entered the Promised Land, which have been preserved by the poets and prophets, are of a people still without the blessings of even the half-fellahin. The Song in Deuteronomy xxxii. relates how Jahweh found Israel in the wildest, barest part of the desert.

He found him in a land of Midbar[1]
In the howling waste of a desert.[2]
He encompassed him, he distinguished him,
He kept him as the apple of his eye.
As an eagle stirreth his nest,
Hovereth over his young,
He spread out his wings, he took him,
He bare him up on his pinions.

* * * *

He made him to ride on the heights of the land,
And to eat of the fruit of the field;
He gave him to suck honey from the cliff,
And oil from the flint of the rock.
Curd of kine and milk of sheep;
With lamb's fat and rams,
Breed of Bashan and he-goats,
With the fat of the kidneys of wheat,
And the blood of the grape thou drankest in foam.

This is an accurate picture of the passage from the barest forms of desert, nomad life to the richest agriculture. The prophets had the same memory, especially Hosea and Jeremiah. And they are supported by older traditions. In each of the main lines of these the recollection has been preserved of the incoming Israel's exaggerated fear of fenced cities and of the greater stature of the settled inhabitants of the land over themselves. But there are no more striking characteristics of the pure nomad of to-day. He dreads a walled town, and the race as a whole is shorter and more meagre in figure than are the fellahin. Every one who has lived among the pure nomads for even a short time is surprised on his return to the villages—is surprised even to shrinking—by the greater height and apparent strength of

[1] That is, *a land not sown* (Jer. ii. 2), where only pasture is possible.
[2] So Driver.

their inhabitants. That this testimony of the nomad origin of Israel should have, as it were so unconsciously, survived in the tradition is very striking. It is corroborated by the feeling against buildings which exists not only in so primitive a story as the Tower of Babel, but in the oracles of the desert prophet Amos; by the description of the appearance of the Deity to Moses in a desert-bush; by the feeling that the proper habitation of the God of Israel is a tent and the opposition to the building of a Temple; and by the absence from early Israel of all conceptions of a future life and even of interest in it, so characteristic, as Wellhausen and Doughty have shown, of the Arabian nomads both before and after the contrary influence of Islam, and largely to be explained by the want of a permanent residence and the shifting, transitory character of the desert life. With so many independent lines of evidence on the point (and they might be multiplied) we feel we have passed out of the region of mere conjecture. If we are to put any confidence in the manifold traditions of Israel concerning their own origins, we must follow these back, behind the many semi-nomadic stages over which the nation passed, to a stage that was purely nomadic, without agriculture or settled sites. And the course of this is further illustrated past all doubt in the processes at work to-day which we have been tracing.

III.

I have hitherto avoided saying anything about Professor Eerdmans' contention, that in proving that the patriarchs were not pure nomads he has destroyed "one of the pillars in the building of the higher criticism," for I wished to argue the question of fact apart from every theory of the history of Israel's religion. But I cannot close this reply to his paper without noticing that it is strange that he should,

even if it were inadvertently, support by his language the too common fallacy that "the higher criticism" is the exclusive practice of one school of modern scholarship. "The higher criticism" is not a certain set of conclusions, a single theory of Israel's history. It is a method whose legitimacy is recognized and whose lines are followed more or less by all schools and tempers at present at work on the Old Testament. Professor Eerdmans' own paper is a learned, though, as I have shown, an incomplete example of its use. But if, as afterwards appears, Professor Eerdmans means that scholars of such differing conclusions as Wellhausen, Marti, Budde and others on the one side, and Winckler and his disciples on the other, are all equally wrong in "feeling certain of the fact that a period of nomad life preceded the conquering of Canaan by the Israelitic tribes" (p. 119), then I think it is clear that he has been able to persuade himself of the justice of his contention only by a limited use of the narratives in Genesis and of the differences between the various kinds of population in Palestine and North Arabia. A wider view and a more detailed employment of both sources leaves the nomadic theory of the origin of at least the main stocks of Israel indubitable. But he would be rash who supposed that such a theory exhausted the secrets of the creation of so composite and wonderful a people. The ethnological and literary evidence point to other elements in their constitution, yet at present leave us very much in the dark as to what these may have been.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.