

the entire known world and was on his way to universal rule, there is no penetrating reason, and one must refer us to unknown and unnamed insertions in the Biblical reports (cf. p. 19), an only slightly disguised admission that the means of explanation have ^{been} denied(?). Here it is brought home that the report of the sources concerning the revelation and conclusion of the covenant on Sinai is not taken seriously, and with this every starting-point for the development of divine relationship fails. Finally, the puzzle therefore remains, which Wellhausen, the great pioneer of the historical development approach, has recognized openly as such: "Why, for example ^{did not (?)} Camosh of Moab become the God of justice and the creator of Heaven and earth, no one can give a sufficient answer." That, in any case, the rise of the ancient God of nature to the tribal deity by Moses, can not serve as a substitute, the well-known historian Eduard Meyer has already plainly expressed, when he named the much quoted sentence, with which one wishes to describe Moses' work, "Jahweh is Israel's God and Israel is Jahweh's people," an "empty (meaningless) phrase"; which could be ^{also} employed mutatis mutandis for other ancient folk religions.

²¹² From what has already been said the initial stage of the delineated development is already questionable, so the following historical epochs show also plainly enough, how little the attempt, to make understandable the historical process by the law of development, can master the actual difficulties. The weight, that is placed upon the social conflict as a factor of the religious conflict, can also not explain approximately the divine message of the prophets in their singular greatness, since the announce-ment of the coming judgement is completely independent from that. That the God of these men