

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 *The Expositor* can be found here:

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

Specially suggestive in this last relation are the indications in the Gospels themselves that, even during His earthly ministry, Christ's body possessed powers and obeyed laws higher than those to which ordinary humanity is subject. Two of the best attested incidents in the cycle of Gospel tradition—His Walking on the Sea,¹ and the Transfiguration²—will occur as examples. Mighty powers worked in Him which already suggested to Herod One risen from the dead;³ powers which might be expected to manifest themselves in a higher degree when He actually did rise.

JAMES ORR.

HAVE THE HEBREWS BEEN NOMADS?

I.

It is generally received that the Israelitic nation is the offspring of Nomad tribes. The patriarchs were like the sheikhs of the Beduin tribes of our time. After the Exodus those tribes turned again to their old manner of life. Then they conquered Palestine and passed from the nomad to agricultural life.

This supposition is one of the pillars in the building of the higher criticism and the history of the religion of Israel. If the Israelites did not pass to agricultural life before the time of the Judges and Kings, it is very improbable that they would have possessed laws dealing with the cultivation of the fields and with harvest festivals. Such laws must be of much younger origin than the Israelitic tradition assumes and cannot date back to the days of Moses. In

¹ Matt. xiv. 22-33; Mark vi. 45-52; John vi. 51-71. In St. Matthew's narrative St. Peter also shared this power till his faith failed.

² Matt. xvii. 1-8; Mark ix. 2-8; Luke ix. 28-36. Wellhausen (*Das Evang. Marci*, pp. 75-6) actually supposes that the Transfiguration was originally an appearance of the Risen Christ to St. Peter. Loisy follows him in the conjecture (ii. p. 39).

³ Matt. xiv. 2.

the history of the Israelitic religion the contrast between the simple religion of the Beduin tribes and the religion of the more civilized Canaanites seems to be of great importance for the understanding of the growth and deepening of the religious ideas. W. E. Addis writes a chapter on the influence of settled life in Canaan on the religion of the Hebrews, and Wellhausen, Smend, Marti, Budde, Stade, Cornill, Nowack, Guthe, Winckler, Jeremias and many others feel certain of the fact that a period of nomad life preceded the conquering of Canaan by the Israelitic tribes.

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 population in Palestine and North Arabia. Seen from a distance these differences seem to be insignificant, but as a matter of fact they are of the utmost importance for the right explanation of the narratives in Genesis. The influence of the common opinion is so strong that even Ed. Meyer, who made such excellent remarks about the life of the patriarchs in *die Israeliten* (Halle, 1906), does not draw the conclusion which follow from his observation, that the narratives in Genesis deal with semi-nomads. He does not lay sufficient stress upon the difference between semi-nomads and nomads, and goes so far as to deny that the patriarchs knew agricultural life. "Ackerbau spielt bei ihnen gar keine Rolle" (p. 305). In the following pages I intend to show that agriculture was of great importance to the patriarchs, and that they never were nomads as is generally supposed.

II.

The common opinion that the Israelites once passed from nomad to agricultural life is only based upon the narratives in Genesis. There is no other ground for this conception

of the oldest history of Israel. Genesis tells us about the migrations of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. We are informed that they possessed flocks and herds. People living in this way are not settled, otherwise they would not move so often. Therefore scholars generally conclude, from the migrations and the herds of the patriarchs, that they were nomads. In doing so one meets some slight difficulties in some chapters of Genesis, but the impression of the nomadic life of the patriarchs is so strong, that these difficulties are easily put aside or overlooked.

We cannot understand the narratives in Genesis without a certain amount of knowledge about life in Palestine and Arabia. The inhabitants of these countries may be divided into three classes.¹ First there are the Beduins, the proper nomads. These people live in booths and move constantly. Their encampment seldom remains more than a few days on the same spot. They are travelling all the year round in a wide circuit—their “*dira*.” They feed themselves from the products of the herds and flocks and are wholly depending upon these herds for their existence. They do not cultivate agricultural products. If they eat them, it is because they have been able to get some in exchange for their wool or by robbery. Bread is a luxury. They drink water or milk, not wine. Theirs is a poor existence, quite familiar with scarcity of food and even with hunger.

Then there are the people living in towns. They are in a much better condition. They are cultivating the fields near the towns or in the oases. They dwell in houses, live by agriculture, trade and commerce. The free Beduins look upon them with contempt. They are afraid of the Beduins, who are always ready to rob the more wealthy townsmen, when they can do so without peril.

¹ Cf. A. Musil, “*Arabia Petraea*,” iii., *Ethnologischer Reisebericht*, Wien, 1908, pp. 22–28.

Between these two classes lives a third one, that could be called the semi-nomadic class. Some of them chiefly keep goats and sheep. At the present time they are called the Ma'aze. They cannot so easily move as the Beduins, who keep camels. The goats and sheep must drink every day, or at least every second day; so they can only live near water and need a better soil than the Beduins do. They like to cultivate a piece of land. Others are more like the townspeople. They are called by Musil, "Halb-Fellahin." 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. It is no easy task to grow corn in those dry regions. The oppression of the population of a neighbouring town sometimes compels them to move; but when they have found sufficient water in another place they first pitch their tents and afterwards build their houses on the new soil. They possess cattle, and their flocks pasture in the desert. Their herdsmen often cover wide distances and do not come home for weeks. 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. They are equally despised by these free sons of the desert, who look upon nearly every sort of labour with contempt and consider it to be disgraceful to cultivate the fields.

If we examine the narratives about the patriarchs, we see that they are semi-nomads (Halb-Fellahin). They do not live in the desert like the Beduins do, but in the valleys of Palestine, near Gerar, Beersheba, Hebron, Sichem and

Beth-el. They are not constantly moving, but they remain 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.

According to Genesis xii. 10 Abram depends upon the crops of the fields for his existence. There was a famine in the land, and Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there. He lives in a tent, and he offers his guests milk and butter, as also bread (Gen. xviii. 1). He remains several years in the same place and calls himself (Gen. xxiii. 4) a stranger and sojourner with the children of Heth. He was very rich in cattle and his servants were herdsmen (xiii. 2, 7), but he likes to live (*yashab*) in Canaan. *Yashab* means to dwell, and cannot be said of Beduins. Lot, who is living in the same way as Abram does, lives in "the cities of the Plain" and in hamlets of tents. It is obvious that Beduins do not live in a city. Abram and Lot are semi-nomads, who remain in the same place as circumstances will allow. They live in tents when they are moving, but they like to settle down wherever they may safely do so, and are tolerated by the inhabitants of the country.

Isaac lives in a house (בֵּית, xxvii. 15). And Rebekah took the raiment of Esau, which were with her in the house. He drinks wine (xxvii. 25). Jacob brought him wine and he drank. The Beduins do not have wine to drink it. He blesses Jacob without mentioning the herds with a single word: "See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which Jahve has blessed. Elohim give thee of the dew of heaven and of the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine" (xxvii. 27, 28). xxvi. 12 informs us that Isaac sowed in that land and found in the same year a hundredfold. According to xxvi. 14 he possessed herds and flocks and many fields. Strangely enough the Hebrew text is here always misunderstood. Isaac possessed *'abuddah rabbah*. This

does not mean "a great household" or "many servants" but "numerous fields." The word *'abuddah* occurs also in Job i. 3. In the later Hebrew it occurs very often and means always a piece of cultivated land. It is obvious that Job possessed fields. His oxen were ploughing, God blessed "the work of his hands," his children were living in houses and drinking wine. LXX translates the word by *γεωργία* (Gen. xxvi. 14) and by *ἔργα μεγάλα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (Job i. 3). Etymologically *'abuddah* cannot mean "household" or "servants." It must have had a passive meaning, and it is only by influence of the nomad theory that the word is misunderstood.

The kindred of his wife, Rebekah, are also living in houses. Nahor dwells in a city (Gen. xxiv. 10); the servant of Abraham comes into the house of Laban (xxiv. 32); the relations of Rebekah bless her and say, "Let thy seed possess *the gate* of those which hate them."

Jacob was dwelling in tents, according to Genesis xxv. 27, but he eats *bread* and *pottage of lentils* (xxv. 34). In Haran he is conducted by Laban into his *house* (xxix. 13). His wives are not with him when he is tending the flocks, they stay at home, and Jacob has to send for them if he wishes to see them (xxxi. 4). His son, Reuben, finds mandrakes "in the days of the wheat harvest" (xxx. 14). After his returning to Palestine, he builds a house and stables for his cattle in Succoth. Near Sichem he bought a parcel of ground (Gen. xxxiii. 17-19). Such is not the way of Beduins. He stays at home in Hebron, whilst his sons are tending the herds and flocks. Apparently he is a peasant. We cannot understand the dream of Joseph about the sheaves he and his brethren were binding in the field, if we do not admit that we are introduced into a scene of agricultural life. If Jacob and his sons were Beduins, Joseph could not have told them a dream like this one (Gen. xxxvii. 5 seq.).

Judah dwells (Gen. xxxviii.) in a house. Like Laban he leaves his home when going to shear his sheep (Gen. xxxi. 19, xxxviii. 12). This proves him not to be a Beduin, who is encamping in the place where his flocks are pasturing.

Jacob and his sons need corn. In times of famine they have to send to Egypt for it, like Rib-Addi, the governor of Byblos in the Amarna letters. From this it is apparent that they do not live like the Beduins do. His sons have found their money in their corn-sacks and they are afraid to go to Egypt a second time. Jacob wishes to send a present to the Egyptian official who sells the corn. A Beduin could only send products of the flocks, wool or cheese. Jacob sends of the *zimrat ha-ares*, of the fruit of the land (Gen. xliii. 11). It is also obvious, from the narrative about his travelling to Egypt, that he is a peasant. For nomads it is very easy to move. They have only to load their animals with their tents and utensils and they may travel in whatever direction they like. Jacob apparently is in a quite different condition. He cannot take all his things with him like the Beduins. Joseph sends him the following message : Do not regard your stuff, for the good of Egypt is yours. He sends down wagons drawn by oxen (like the Philistines used under Ramses III.) in order to convey his father, the women and the children to Egypt. When Jacob saw these wagons he decided to go and see Joseph before he died (Gen. xlv. 19 seq.). The supposed Beduins really use these wagons (xlv. 5). Genesis xlv. 31-xlvii. 5 contains also sufficient proof that Jacob and his sons are people accustomed to settled life. The way in which Joseph impresses upon the minds of his brethren what they must tell Pharaoh about their profession shows that they are abusing the king for some reason. Most probably they are afraid to be compelled to labour. Therefore they pretend to be shepherds, "for every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians."

Joseph teaches his brethren what to say if they are asked about their profession, after having previously informed them what information he himself will give Pharaoh about their occupation. Ye shall say: Thy servants have been keepers of cattle from our youth even until now, both we and our fathers. They can do so because they actually possess cattle, but it would be needless to impress this answer upon their minds if it were the whole and simple truth.

Wellhausen maintains that the Israelitic tribes turned again to their old manner of life after the Exodus. Our only source for this is the book of Exodus. But there it is very clearly shown that the tribes do not know how to live in the desert. After leaving Egypt they immediately make for Palestine. They are beaten by Amalek and have to sojourn some years in the desert before they venture to attack the Canaanites. Beduins feel perfectly happy in their "dira"; the Israelites, however, do not know how to live on the products of the flocks, and try from the beginning to settle down in Palestine. We understand this fully if we only remember the importance of agriculture for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

This is confirmed by what is told (Gen. xi. 28 seq.) about Terah and Abraham. They lived in Ur Kasdim and Haran, and belonged to the townspeople and not to the Beduins.

If we accept the nomad theory, Abraham would be an example of a townsman passing from the settled to the nomad life. This is contrary to what usually happens. Nomads settle down and become peasants, but peasants do not become nomads.

Even those offsprings of Abraham who live in Arabia are no nomads. The Ishmaelites are living in the oasis of northern Arabia. There is a great difference between the agricultural life of those who dwell in the oases and the nomads. Everybody who has read the travels in Arabia Deserta of

C. M. Doughty, will admit this. The Ishmaelites dwell in the well-known oases, Dumah and Teima (Gen. xxv. 14, 15). They live in *haserim* and *ṭirot*, viz., in villages and encampments surrounded by walls. The many names which are composed with *haser* prove that *haser* is a village surrounded by small walls (Num. xxxiv. 4, Josh. xv. 27, xix. 5, etc.). *Tira* is mentioned (Num. xxxi. 10) in parallelism to "town." It was a walled encampment. The encampments of the Beduins have no walls, as they are moving nearly every fourth day. The children of Kedar live, according to Isaiah xlii. 11, in towns and villages. They are tradespeople (Ezek. xxvii. 21), and travel from their oases to the coast. They pitch their tents when they are travelling in caravans. Psalm cxx. 5, Song of Songs i. 5 these tents are mentioned. We would again be mistaken if we concluded from the tents to the nomad life of the Kedarites. The nomads are no tradespeople.

The children of Keturah also are settled people. Midian is dwelling in towns (Num. xxxi. 10, 1 Sam. xv. 6). The Midianites are merchantmen (Gen. xxxvii. 28, 36) like the Ishmaelites (Gen. xxxvii. 25, 28, xxxix. 1). The settled population of South Arabia is derived from Abraham by Jokshan. Sheba is known from 1 Kings xi. The merchants of Dedan are mentioned Ezekiel xxvii. 20, xxxviii. 13, Isaiah xxi. 13, Jeremiah xxv. 23. Enoch in Genesis iv. 17 is the name of a town.

As far as we can identify the names of the Ishmaelites and children of Keturah, mentioned in Genesis xxv. 2-4, 12-18, they are all names of a settled population.

The same conclusion may be drawn with regard to the Aramaic relations of the patriarchs. We have already mentioned that Laban dwelt in a town and lived in a house. As yet we are not able to identify all the names of the Aramaeans that are mentioned in Genesis xxii. 20-24.

Some of the names, however, allude to semi-nomads. Uz is the name of the land Job lived in. We have seen that his oxen were ploughing. Buz is mentioned Jeremiah xxv. 23 with the well-known oasis Teima. Kesed refers to the Kasdim in South Babylonia. Tebah, Tahash and Maacah are, according to Meyer, p. 241, "Districten und Ortschaften des syrischen Kulturlandes." For Tebah he refers to 2 Samuel viii. 8 (LXX), for Tahash to Tachsi of the Egyptian inscriptions (W. M. Müller, *Asia und Europa*, pp. 251-258). Aram Maacha is known from 1 Chronicles xix. 6 as a district near Mount Hermon. The inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser I. mention the Aramaeans as living in the mudbaru in Mesopotamia. They are called Achlame. The word mudbaru (midbar) has given the impression that the Achlame were nomads. A. Sanda calls them nomads in *der Alte Orient*, iv. 2. As Tiglath-pileser I. conquers six cities of the Achlame, they cannot be Beduins. Numerous Aramaic tribes lived near the Tigris, in the district that is afterwards called Beth-Aramaje. They possessed much cattle. Tiglath-pileser III. mentions five towns belonging to them.¹ They are also semi-nomads. We only find Aramaeans in the "Culturland," and we are without any knowledge about Aramaic nomads that lived in the Syrio-Arabian desert. Meyer says: "The home of the Aramaeans is the desert (p. 241): from here they immigrated in the "culturland." This is a mere supposition. Our sources do not tell us a single word about Aramaic nomads.

Everything points in the same direction. Old Testament scholars have been misled by the herds and flocks of the patriarchs. The patriarchs are men like Job and Nabal. Nobody, however, would think about calling Nabal a nomad. He is the owner of numerous sheep and goats, but

¹ *Keilinschr. Bibl.* i. pp. 32, 33, ii. p. 10.

he is also cultivating fields (1 Sam. xxv. 18 seq.) and lives in a house (v. 35 seq.). His flocks are pasturing at a great distance from his house in Ma'on. He is going to shear his sheep like Judah.

There is one argument in favour of the nomad life of old Israel we have not yet dealt with, viz., the nomad life of the Rechabites, mentioned Jeremiah xxxv. 6 seq. The Rechabites were ardent servants of Jahve (2 Kings x. 15), and according to the common opinion they were people who resisted the influence of settled life with great persistence, even when the whole nation yielded to the new circumstances. In the times of Jeremiah they still refuse to drink wine, and say : "Jonadab, the son of Rechab, commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye, nor your sons, for ever; neither shall ye build houses, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyards, nor have any; but all your days ye shall dwell in tents, that ye may live many days in the land wherein ye sojourn." It seems hardly possible to maintain that the Rechabites, the servants of Jahve and the friends of the Israelites, are no nomads. And yet it is a mistake to call them Beduins, and from Jeremiah xxxv. 6 seq. we cannot derive an argument for the nomad ideal in Israelitic religion, as Budde has done.

The problem of the Rechabites is connected with the Kenite problem, for the Rechabites were Kenites. B. Stade has made many excellent remarks in his article "das Kainszeichen" (*Z.A.T.W.*, 1894), where he is dealing with the Kenites, but he has brought us on the wrong track by maintaining that the Kenites were nomads, keepers of flocks, poor people that were dangerous to the peasants of Canaan by their robberies and thefts. Sayce is perfectly right in calling the Kenites "smiths"¹ He does not point

¹ *Israel and the Surrounding Nations*, p. 94. *The Races of the Old Testament*, p. 118; cf. *Theol. Tydschr.*, 1908, pp. 492-507.

out, however, their relation with the settled population.

The Beduins and the townspeople are mortal enemies. We do not see how it is possible that the Israelites and Kenites could be on friendly terms in the days of Sisera and Saul, if the Israelites were peasants and the Kenites nomads (Jud. iv. 11, 1 Sam. xv. 6). The word Cain means "smith," and Cain is the father of the Kenites (Jud. iv. 11, Num. xxiv. 21, 22). 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, who are not able to repair their weapons and kettles. The Beduins despise these travelling smiths, but, because they need them, they are seen wherever they travel. There is no connubium between the Beduins and the travelling smiths. The Sonna and Solubba of the present time are in exactly the same condition as the Kenites in the days of Saul and Moses. The Solubba obey the precept of their patriarchs, who forbade them to be cattle keepers, and bade them live of their hunting in the wilderness, and alight before the Beduin booths, that they might become their guests and labour as smiths in the tribe for their living (C. M. Doughty, *Travels*, i. 281). The tent of the smith is standing away from the other tents. The smiths are living in the same condition among the Masai, the Somalis and Abyssinians.¹ The word "Kain" is an invective among the Arabs. Already the daughters of the smith in Midian were not used to be well treated by the shepherds, and their father was astonished to see them come home at an early hour without having been molested by the nomads (Exod. ii. 18). Cain, the father of the Kenites, is the first man who builds a town (Gen. iv. 17). He was a tiller of the ground and lived on the fruit of the ground (Gen. iv. 2 seq.). The

¹ Cf. Th. Bent, *The Sacred City of the Ethiopians*, p. 212; Stade, *Z.A.T.W.*, 1894, p. 255.

narrative in Genesis iv. 1-16 explains the position of the contemned smith, who is despised by the nomads, but is quite safe where he pitches his tent. This narrative is a strong argument against the theory of Stade, who maintains that the Kenites are nomads. Cain is (Gen. iv.) the peasant, and Abel is the cattle-keeper, and it is impossible to invert this, as Stade tries to do. In the tent of Heber the Kenite the workman's hammer is close at hand (Jud. v. 26). In Genesis iv. 21 the word Cain = "smith" is a gloss. The original form of this verse must have been: Tubal was the father of all workers in brass and iron in the same way as Jabul and Jubal were the fathers of nomads and musicians. The glosses Cain and hammerer (*lotesh*) have been introduced into the text, and so the original text was corrupted.

So Cain and his offspring are at the same time townspeople and nomads. We do not understand how these contemned smiths can be on friendly terms with the Israelitic tribes near Sinai, if these tribes are nomads. It is impossible that a man of importance, as Moses doubtless was, should have married the daughter of a smith. This can only be understood by admitting that the Israelites were also people used to agricultural life.

We return now to the Rechabites. According to 1 Chronicles ii. 55 they were Kenites. The Kenites worshipped Jahve like the Israelites. The most probable explanation of this seems to me that Jahve, the god of thunder and lightning, who revealed himself in fire, was the patron of the smiths, the fire-workers. These travelling smiths came to Jerusalem as the hordes of the Babylonians swept the country. They could be set as an example before the Israelitic worshippers of Jahve. They were obeying the commandments of their patriarch, but Israel did not obey the commandments of the Lord. Of course this does not imply that the Rechabites and Israelites once had the same customs and manner of life.

At the end of this article I want to lay stress upon the fact that I do not bring forward in these pages some hypothesis or theory that is based on certain suppositions or combinations. We have only read the narratives of Genesis. In these narratives there is not a single text in favour of the theory that a period of nomad life preceded the settled life in Canaan. The importance of this conclusion for the higher criticism is obvious. We see at once that laws dealing with agriculture, mentioning the house and the fields, are not necessarily merely by this fact of a later origin. In the history of Israel this simple remark also opens out a different perspective. Merenptah devastated in his fifth year the fields of Israel. It is generally received either that this Israel must be a part of the tribes that never went to Egypt, or that the Exodus took place at a much earlier date than the reign of Merenptah. Now we see that it is quite probable that Israel had not yet been in Egypt, as its fields were devastated by the Egyptian army.

B. D. EERDMANS.

HERR ALOIS MUSIL ON THE LAND OF MOAB.

II. SOUTHERN MOAB.

THE previous article, in last month's *EXPOSITOR*, covered the two northern districts of Moab : el-Belka and el-Jebâl.

The boundary between el-Jebâl and the next district to the south, el-Kûra, is a valley, which, though it does not issue into the Dead Sea, but is only the chief tributary of the Môjeb, yet, from its length and depth, ranks as one of the great dividing lines of the country. Known on its lowest reaches as the Seyl-Heydân and the Seyl el-Ĥammâm, in its middle stretch (which is crossed by the Roman and the present trunk-roads) as Wâdy el-Wâleh, and on its upper