

scholars will disagree about the treatment of passages of which the Hebrew is of questionable accuracy, or defective, or hard to decipher.

After writing thus far I saw another palimpsest, and read on it in Greek uncials (beneath Midrash) the first piece of New Testament found in the *Genizah* collection. In the first line is (or was) ο φηλιξ followed by ανε, the beginning of the verb

'deferred' (Ac 24<sup>22</sup>). Thus the fragment agrees here with the *textus receptus*, as again, for example, in v.<sup>23</sup>, 'And that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister OR COME unto him.' The next page has not much legible Greek of its own, but some words, as το νυν εχον πορευου, can be read through from the other side.

## Israel's Historical Recollections.

BY PROFESSOR EDUARD KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

THE most recent commentary on *Genesis*, which has just been published,<sup>1</sup> closes with the following words:—'To the beginnings of Israel historical recollections do not reach back, any more than with other nations.' The latter instance appealed to embodies a general proposition. But the commentary before us says not a word about the *special* relation of Israel to historical reminiscences. It never raises the question whether a nation which had memories of extraordinary value to preserve might not lay special weight upon the transmitting of its traditions. Nor is any attempt made to trace the indications which prove that this nation possessed a strong genius for the preserving of its reminiscences. In the following remarks I will seek to supply these omissions.

First of all, let it be noted that Israel had the custom of creating actual and externally perceptible supports for historical reminiscences. Such *fulcra memoriae* were the 'cairn of witness' (Gn 31<sup>47</sup>), the pot of manna (Ex 16<sup>33</sup>), the tables of the Law (Ex 34<sup>35</sup> 40<sup>20</sup>), Aaron's rod that budded (Nu 17<sup>10</sup>), the stones from the Jordan (Jos 4<sup>6ff.</sup>), the erecting of an altar on Mt. Ebal, and inscribing of the law upon the altar (Jos 8<sup>30ff.</sup>); note specially, also, the altar by Jordan (Jos 22<sup>26ff.</sup>), the great stone under the oak by the sanctuary of Jahweh (Jos 24<sup>26ff.</sup>), the stone Eben-ezer (1 S 7<sup>12</sup>), the sword of Goliath hung up as a national memorial in the sanctuary at Nob (1 S 21<sup>9</sup>), the statue which Absalom caused to be erected in the king's vale, that it might preserve the

recollection of his name (2 S 18<sup>18</sup>), and the monument of stones which the people raised for him (v.<sup>17</sup>). It is an extremely interesting circumstance, also, that in Israel one was fond of noting the date when a city was built (Nu 13<sup>22</sup>, Hebron built seven years before Zoan), or a national custom introduced (1 S 30<sup>25</sup>). Noteworthy, also, is the tenacity of memory which recalled the ancient attack of the Amalekites (1 S 15<sup>2ff.</sup>), or the ban pronounced long before on the city of Jericho (1 K 16<sup>34</sup>).

Further, I may refer to the fact that in Ex 13<sup>8-10</sup> a command is given to keep the origin of the Passover celebration alive in the consciousness of future generations. In the same passage the continual inculcating of the Divine laws is also enjoined. So also in Ex 13<sup>11-16</sup> and Dt 6<sup>4-9</sup> 11<sup>13-21</sup>. The reading of the Deuteronomic law to the people is commanded in Dt 31<sup>10-13</sup>. Moreover, the priests have the function assigned to them of transmitting the Divine statutes from generation to generation (Lv 10<sup>11</sup>, Dt 33<sup>6-11</sup>, Jer 18<sup>18</sup>, Ezk 22<sup>26</sup> 44<sup>23f.</sup>, Hos 4<sup>6</sup>, Mic 3<sup>11</sup>, Zeph 3<sup>4</sup>, Hag 2<sup>11-13</sup>, Mal 2<sup>4-8</sup>). In particular, the Song of Moses is to be learned by the people (Dt 31<sup>21</sup>), as well as the Elegy which David composed upon the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 S 1<sup>18</sup>).

Another group of positive tokens of the historicity of the Old Testament consists of those statements which assign a *non-Israelitish* origin to some important phenomenon in Israel's history. Is not the institution of subordinate tribunals expressly traced back (Ex 18<sup>10ff.</sup>) to the counsel of the Midianite priest Jethro? At the building of Solomon's temple, is not the execution of the

<sup>1</sup> *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alt. Test.* Herausgegeben von Karl Marti. Fünfte Lieferung: die Genesis erklärt von H. Holzinger. Freiburg: Mohr, 1898.

work in brass ascribed to Hiram, 'a man of Tyre' (1 K 7<sup>13</sup>), the son of a Tyrian man (v. 14, 2 Ch 2<sup>13</sup>)? Were the Hebrews, then, so blinded by national pride as to refuse to admit any foreign element in their regular civil and religious institutions? No, from the Old Testament narratives no such inference can be drawn. It was later authors who first gave an Israelitish father to Hiram, the artificer brought from Tyre (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 3. 4, *πατὴρ δὲ Οὐρίου, γένος Ἰσραηλιτῶν*).

Again, the Old Testament narratives record many stages and nuances in the development of *Israelitish* elements themselves. In not a few passages the historical books note when a commencement or a change took place in some department of civilized life. The series of such notes opens with the data about 'the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle' (Gn 4<sup>20</sup>), *i.e.* the originator of the nomadic mode of life, which was an advance upon the stage of civilization reached by troglodytes or fishers or huntsmen. The Old Testament mentions also the first masters of music and of the smith's art (Gn 4<sup>21f.</sup>). It does not disdain to record the beginning of the culture of the vine (9<sup>20</sup>). Quite surprising, also, is the zeal with which the Old Testament notes the changing of place names; Gn 14<sup>2b, 3b, 8a</sup> (cf. 17<sup>5</sup>) 23<sup>2, 19</sup>; 28<sup>19</sup> (Luz = Bethel) 35<sup>6, 27</sup>, Jos 18<sup>13</sup>, Jg 1<sup>23, 26</sup> 18<sup>29</sup>; Jos 14<sup>15</sup> (Kiriath-arba = Hebron) 15<sup>13, 54</sup> 20<sup>7</sup> 21<sup>11</sup>, Jg 1<sup>10</sup>; Jos 15<sup>15</sup> (Kiriath-sepher = Debir) 15<sup>49</sup>, Jg 1<sup>11</sup>; Jg 19<sup>20</sup> (|| 1 Ch 11<sup>4</sup>, Jebus = Jerusalem). Compare also the explanation of the older names of the months, 1 K 6<sup>1</sup>, etc. (the whole series will be found in my *Historisch-comparativer Syntax des Hebräischen*, § 357 f.). Of interest is also the remark as to the relative lateness of the name 'prophet': 'he that is now called a "prophet" was beforetime called a "seer"' (1 S 9<sup>9</sup>).

The foregoing observations have already touched the point that the Hebrew historians also mark the new stages which are reached in the history of religion and of worship. For the title *Jahweh Zeb'oth* first appears from 1 S 1<sup>3</sup> onwards, and with the older form, 'Jahweh, God of hosts' (2 S 5<sup>10</sup>), the abbreviated form, 'Jahweh of hosts,' runs parallel (1 Ch 11<sup>9</sup>; see further my *Syntax*, § 285 a). The expression 'sitting upon the cherubim' (יָשֵׁב [עַל] כְּרֻבִים) is found first in 1 S 4<sup>4</sup>, and occurs elsewhere only in 2 S 6<sup>2</sup>, 2 K 19<sup>15</sup> (|| Is 37<sup>16</sup>), Ps 80<sup>2</sup> 99<sup>1</sup>, 1 Ch 13<sup>6</sup>. Further, the name, 'the Holy One of Israel,' appears first in Is 1<sup>4</sup>

5<sup>19, 24</sup> etc. On the other hand, the abandoning of the custom of calling even the God of Israel *Ba'al*, *i.e.* 'Lord,' is expressly signaled in Hos 2<sup>18</sup>. An advance in the doctrine of retribution is marked in Jer 31<sup>29f.</sup>, Ezk 18<sup>2</sup>, etc. The practice of employing music in the worship of Jahweh is carried back to David, in Neh 12<sup>24</sup>. This is also touched upon in 1 Ch 6<sup>16ff.</sup>. Other elements in the arrangements for worship are traced to David in 1 Ch 9<sup>22ff.</sup> 15<sup>2, 16</sup> 23<sup>2ff.</sup>. Of quite peculiar weight are 1 Ch 23<sup>3, 27</sup> (contrasted with Nu 3<sup>23, 30</sup>), 2 Ch 8<sup>14</sup>, etc.

In like manner have the Hebrew people, in their recollections, distinguished the degrees in which various individuals deviated from the legitimate religion. The historical books keep quite apart from one another, and regard as three entirely different things, the patronizing of a multiplicity of sanctuaries, the worship of images of Jahweh, and polytheism. For the kings whose sin consisted merely in tolerating a multiplicity of altars of Jahweh are least blamed (1 K 15<sup>14</sup> 22<sup>44</sup>, 2 K 12<sup>3</sup> 14<sup>3f.</sup> 15<sup>4, 34f.</sup>). From these relatively pious kings those rulers are distinguished who, contrary to Ex 20<sup>4f.</sup>, thought to represent Jahweh the spiritual God by idols, 1 K 12<sup>28f.</sup> 14<sup>16 (23)</sup> 15<sup>26, 34</sup> 16<sup>13, 19, 26</sup>, 2 K 3<sup>3</sup> 10<sup>20</sup> 13<sup>2</sup> 14<sup>24</sup> 15<sup>9, 18, 24, 28</sup>, cf. 17<sup>2</sup>. The worst grade of religious unfaithfulness was reached, however, by those kings of Israel and Judah who, transgressing Ex 20<sup>3</sup>, actually served *other* gods, 1 K 16<sup>31</sup>, 'And it was the smallest matter (cf. my *Syntax*, § 309 b, 353 f.) that Ahab walked in the sins of Jeroboam . . . and he proceeded beyond that to serve Baal'; 1 K 18<sup>22</sup> 21<sup>26</sup>, 2 K 1<sup>3</sup>; 3<sup>2f.</sup>, 'Joram, king of Israel, turned away from the service of Baal, but to the sins of Jeroboam he clave'; 8<sup>27</sup>; 10<sup>28f.</sup>, 'Jehu rooted out the service of Baal from the kingdom of Israel, but from the sins of Jeroboam he turned not away'; 16<sup>3</sup>, Ahaz of Judah followed the religious maxims of the kings of Israel. Thus the historical books of the Hebrews clearly draw a distinction between merely violating the ceremonial law and denying the fundamental religious principles of their nation.

Again, Israel's historians have recorded nothing about Amos, Hosea, Micah, Nahum, etc. So that they did not afterwards survey the list of the great heroes of the theocracy, and arrange their works accordingly. But, finally, this circumstance also is to be noted. The ancient Hebrew historians, in characterizing the most prominent men of their

nation, have not concealed the weaknesses and faults which according to historical tradition attached to them. For instance, in the history of Abraham it is recorded how he asked his wife to give herself out to be his sister (Gn 12<sup>13</sup>). Nor are the fits of doubt hushed up by which a Moses and an Aaron proved their human nature (Nu 20<sup>10f. 24</sup> 27<sup>14</sup>, Dt 32<sup>51</sup>, Ps 106<sup>32f.</sup>). In like manner, the older Hebrew writers have done honour to historical truth in mentioning that David incurred the guilt of adultery (2 S 12<sup>1ff.</sup>, 1 K 15<sup>5</sup>), and that Solomon favoured idolatry (1 K 11<sup>6</sup>). Also, in the portrait of Hezekiah, who is so highly praised (2 K 18<sup>3</sup>), the severe religious-moral sense of Israel has presented not only the light but the shadow (20<sup>17</sup>).

Now it is precisely at the present day that these qualities of Hebrew history deserve to be prominently exhibited. For we hear so often of the 'colouring' by which the real course of the history of Israel is obscured. The truth, however, lies midway between the two extreme judgments, and if I were to sum up the result of all my investigations in a single sentence, I should say: The historical record of the Hebrews, on account of many cracks, cavities, and different strata, is certainly on the one hand not a perfect crystal, but on the other hand, on account of the positive traces of credibility to which I have referred, it is yet a rock which shall for ever withstand the devastating waters of extreme scepticism. In particular, the proofs above cited establish this point, that the historical memory of the Hebrews possessed a *sensorium that noted the advance of the historical process*. Specially rash, therefore, is every attempt to presuppose more and other factors in the development of Israel's history than are mentioned in the Old Testament itself. Every such attempt is bound to justify itself by evidence that cannot be shaken.

The most interesting characteristic of the historical memory of the Hebrews remains still to be mentioned. This lies in the relation in which the dates given in the Old Testament are placed to the *Mosaic epoch* of Israel's history. That is to say, upon the one hand the origin of all the knowledge and the institutions of Israel is not carried back to Moses (see above for the evidence as to the first appearance of the title *Jahweh Zēbā'ōth*). Upon the other hand, many elements of Israelitish history are carried back to a date even earlier than

Moses (e.g. the divine name *El Shaddai*, which is found only in Gn 17<sup>1</sup> 28<sup>3</sup> 35<sup>11</sup> 43<sup>14</sup> 48<sup>3</sup>, Ex 6<sup>3</sup>, Ezk 10<sup>5</sup>). Thus all the splendour with which the Mosaic period shone as the youth of the Israelitish nation (Hos 11<sup>1</sup>), was unable to dim the light which yet gleamed in Israel's memory from *pre-Mosaic* days. Nay, in spite of the pre-eminent greatness of Moses, who was the illustrious hero at the turning-point in Israel's political and religious existence, Abraham and Jacob are recognized as the originators of the national existence and of the religious mission of the people of Israel.

Yet how natural it would have been if the fame of Moses had led the Hebrews to ascribe the foundation of all their national institutions to his time! How readily this might have taken place one can see from the literature of later generations. For in the reproduction of Gn 1-Ex 14 contained in the *Book of Jubilees*, chaps. 2-48 (cf. my *Einleit. in das A. T.*, p. 492 f.), it is recorded that the patriarchs already observed the prescriptions as to sacrifice, which, in the Pentateuch, are dated only from the Mosaic period. Also, according to *Bereshith Rabba* (cf. my *Einleitung*, p. 522), Abraham already obeyed the whole Torah. Why is this confusion not present as early as our Pentateuch? Why in it have the bounds between the Mosaic and the pre-Mosaic period not run into one another? The historical memory of early Israel must have rested upon a surer basis than many suppose. The distinguishing in the Pentateuch of a pre-Mosaic period in Israel's development, appears in fact to be a cardinal point.

But even *within* the pre-Mosaic period different stages in the development are distinguished; e.g. Gn 1<sup>29</sup>; 9<sup>3</sup> (in addition to vegetable food comes now the permission to eat flesh); 17<sup>1ff.</sup> It is also striking that the regular worship of God, in distinction from the casual offering of Cain and Abel (Gn 4<sup>3-5</sup>), is dated from the days of Enosh (4<sup>20b</sup>, *tum coeptum est*, etc.), instead of being traced to Adam and Seth or to Enoch (5<sup>22-24</sup>). How easily could the initiative in any advance in the cultus have been ascribed to Enoch, how numerous are the elements in this advance which are connected with his name in later times (cf. on the Book of Enoch my *Einleitung*, pp. 493-497, 562). Further, Genesis notes a movement from monogamy to polygamy (4<sup>19</sup>). This movement, however, is not represented as one in a straight line; e.g. in the

case of Noah (8<sup>18</sup>) and of Isaac there is no mention of but one wife. Elsewhere, *e.g.* in the *Book of Jubilees*, the names of several wives are supplied. This is not to be explained simply from the different age of the pentateuchal narratives and the later stories. If the different character of the narratives depended only upon the difference of date, there would have been between the patriarchal period and the fixing of the pentateuchal narrative time enough to identify the stages of the development, to supply the missing names, etc. Again, amongst the presents which the Egyptian king gave to Abraham, there are five kinds of animals mentioned, but no horses (Gn 12<sup>16</sup>). So upon the Egyptian monuments prior to the Hyksos period horses are not depicted (cf. Ebers, *Aegypten und die Bücher Mose's*, p. 265 f.; Brugsch, *Steininschrift und Bibelwort*, p. 63). On the other hand, in the narratives relating to later periods, the horses of the Egyptians are freely mentioned (Gn 47<sup>17</sup>, Ex 9<sup>3</sup>, etc., Dt 17<sup>16</sup> 1 K 10<sup>28</sup>).

All these positive indications show that the Hebrew nation had a lively sense of truth in its historical reminiscences. There are also sources mentioned in which ancient traditions of Israel may have been collected, the Book of the Wars of Jahweh (Nu 21<sup>14</sup>), the Book of the Upright (Jos 10<sup>13</sup>, 2 S 1<sup>18</sup>); cf. Ex 17<sup>14</sup> 24<sup>4</sup>, Nu 33<sup>2</sup>, Dt 31<sup>19</sup> 24. But the latest commentary on *Genesis* is entirely silent as to the above-named positive evidences of the trustworthiness of the earliest recollections of Israel. In place of referring to these, it gives us the sentence which is quoted at the beginning of this article, 'To the beginnings of Israel historical recollections do not reach back, any more than with other nations.'

The same commentary says, 'The patriarchal history in its present form is made up of elements from very diverse quarters, and is really an artfully (!) restored substructure of Israel's own history.' In proof of this we read, for instance, 'Those portions of the patriarchal history which treat of the rise of the nation are evidently only a deposit from the occurrences of the immigration and the conquest.' Here I miss only one trifle, any proof of the 'evidently.' Another statement introduced by way of proof, runs, 'Tribes and nations never originate in this world through the splitting up of

rapidly increasing families, but always through amalgamation of families and races.' But neither is this proposition wholly unassailable. If it alludes to the circumstance established by experience, that the marriage of relations tends to degenerate the species, yet this experience is not without its exceptions. Else, how could the human race ever have arisen at all? Besides, in the case of Isaac and of Jacob we are told that they married relations belonging to a different branch of the family. Marriage with wives of neighbouring tribes is also contemplated in Gn 34<sup>10</sup>, and actually carried out in 38<sup>2</sup> 41<sup>45</sup>.

The main incidents of the history related of Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham, may, in my judgment, quite well have happened. In any case, the latest commentator on *Genesis*, who is disposed to regard Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham as deposed divinities (p. 269 f.), makes no mention of the features which plead in favour of the historical existence of the three patriarchs. In the first place, Israel would have had no sufficient motive for inventing a pre-Mosaic sojourn in Canaan, if there had been no real foundation for this notion. The circumstance that the patriarchs had settled in Canaan would surely have given no warrant for the later conquest of Canaan. Further, the ancestors of the Hebrews, who felt themselves to be strangers in Egypt, would naturally, in the course of their migration from the Euphrates, come in contact with the land of Canaan. Then, if the Hebrews had created the figure of Abraham, they would not have portrayed him as one who moved from place to place as a simple colonist who was frequently treated as an enemy. Is it likely, again, that the picture of Jacob would have been so conceived as it is presented to us in *Genesis*? Finally, what inventive fancy, when it goes to work, can produce from its materials, we see from the later representations, *e.g.* of Abraham. He was king of Damascus, etc. (cf. Justin, *Historiae*, xxxvi. 2, 'Post Damascus Azelus, mox Adores et Abraham et Israhel reges fuere. Sed Israhel rex decem filiorum proventus majoribus suis clariorem fecit. Itaque populum in decem regna divisum filiis tradidit'; cf. also Judith 5<sup>6f.</sup>; Jos. *Ant.* vii. 1 f., viii. 2; Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* ix. 17 f.; the Koran vi. 74-87).