

- p. 15, ll. 5–4 . . . Hè cállèd hèr: ‘Ánnÿ!’; ‘Hè cállèd hèr Ánn’.
 from bottom: *Read*: . . . Hè cállèd hèr: ‘Ánnÿ!’; ‘Hè cállèd hèr Ánnÿ’.
 l. 3: (p. 12) *read* (p. 11).
- p. 16, l. 9: . . . the intonation . . . one of ‘exclamation’—as we saw above in
 ‘Hè cállèd hèr: ‘Ánnÿ!’
Read: . . . ‘Hè cállèd hèr: ‘Ánnÿ!’
- p. 17, l. 2: (pp. 6, 7)
Read: (p. 8).
- p. 18: delete footnotes and numbers referring to them.
- p. 19, par. 3, Now there is no circular reasoning . . .
 l. 3: *Read* this as beginning a new paragraph.
- p. 19, fn. 2: ‘Is het Hebreuws . . .’
Read: ‘Is het Hebreuws . . .’
- p. 20, l. 10 (i.e. ‘leading words’; for example, ‘rufen’, ‘seed’)
 from bottom: *Read*: (i.e. ‘leading words’ = recurring words or stems which are
 supposed to express a leading or otherwise important concept in
 a passage).
- p. 21, l. 12: . . . sounds piercing and thin, beside *tōhū wābōhū*. It is like . . .
Read: . . . sounds piercing and thin; beside *tōhū wābōhū* it is
 like . . .

DENIS BALY

THE TREATMENT OF GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURES IN BIBLICAL MAPS

The spate of new Biblical atlases which have been appearing since World War II shows at present no sign of drying up. Indeed, it is increasingly realized that for a proper understanding of the Bible an intimate knowledge of the environment is necessary, and that much of this information is best conveyed in map form. What is more open to question, however, is whether we are at the present time being given all the information we ought to have, and whether such information as the maps do give is as accurate or as efficient as it could be.

Maps are not a mere addendum to the text; rather, they are themselves a text, conveying by means of conventional symbols information which cannot properly be expressed in words. For most people, and apparently also for most Biblical map-makers, the primary function of a map is to show where places are, and without doubt this is important. The exact location of ancient sites is an absolute necessity for any reputable Biblical atlas. The identification of these sites is essentially the work of trained archaeologists, at whose feet geographers and cartographers must humbly dispose themselves, but the identification of a place mentioned in the Bible with a particular *tel* in the Fertile Crescent, though the fundamental starting point, is only the beginning of the information that ought to be provided about it. One should know also, at the very least, how it is related to the physical landscape, to the valleys, hills, rivers and plains, and here, alas, Biblical

maps are almost all woefully deficient. For some reason the standards of resolute accuracy, which are rightly insisted upon for the identification of sites, are not applied to the representation of relief. Of all the Biblical atlases published in recent years, only one, Grollenberg's *Atlas of the Bible* (Nelson, 1956), has a really accurate method of showing relief, using contours and layer-colouring. All the others are more general, and many are in places seriously inaccurate; perhaps worst of all are the deplorable end-papers of the *Interpreter's Bible*.

At this point the Biblical cartographer often seems to think that his duty to the faithful has been accomplished. Almost all Biblical maps are representations of Palestine, or less often the neighbouring countries, at various points in Biblical history, showing the towns and boundaries of the time upon this inadequate relief base. Sometimes the maps are enlivened by dramatic arrows, darting like the thunderbolts of Yahweh, to illustrate impartially a military invasion, the sad exile of the dispossessed, and the wanderings of the Patriarchs.¹ These symbols, it is true, are not without value, for they emphasize the dynamic quality of Biblical history, but they are usually too generalized to give accurate information, and are even misleading when they leap triumphantly over the most formidable obstacles.

Two major weaknesses at present characterize all Biblical atlases: a failure to present *all* the facts of the Biblical environment, and a failure to grasp, and therefore to present effectively, the relationship of Palestine to the world in which it was placed. In all existing atlases this tiny country looms a great deal too large, and the reader fails to become involved in the thinking of those who could not but count themselves as grasshoppers in comparison with the mighty nations which threatened constantly to engulf them. Of course, considerable space must be given to Palestine, because it is, after all, the area where most of the Biblical history took place, but it needs to be shown in its true proportion, and this poses a cartographical problem to which, as yet, far too little attention has been paid.

Man reacts to the totality of his environment, even though he may in course of time select those aspects of it which seem to him the more important. When a group of people move into a new environmental situation, they find themselves confronted by a mass of uncoordinated facts, amidst which they must succeed in discerning some form of order if they are to continue to survive, both physically and as a coherent society. Their 'gods', that is to say their concepts of fundamental reality, are normally related directly to the facts of their immediate environment, and therefore to understand the gods of the nations, and to understand also why the Hebrews were brought to reject the gods, it is necessary to know the environment thoroughly. This is *not* to say that the actions and decisions of men are rigidly determined by the environment, but only to insist that apart from the environment these actions and decisions cannot be understood. A comprehension of environmental factors should at least save us from repeating unthinkingly, 'Le désert est monothéiste.'

Even the most casual reading of the Old Testament makes clear that

¹ They are used to excess in the latest atlas to appear, *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*, discussed below.

climate and vegetation played a vital part in the thinking of the people. When it would rain, whether it would 'rain upon one city, and not upon another city', how much rain there would be, were questions, quite literally, of life and death for people who lived on the margins of the desert. The wilderness and the solitary place terrified the villager; and so also, though this is less realized, did the forest, which was the home of dangerous wild beasts, and charged with a disturbing and numinous superabundance of life. He could feel at home as little in the dense luxuriance of Carmel and Sharon as in the trackless wilderness, or on the restless sea. Admittedly, there are problems about constructing maps of ancient vegetation, and disputes as to whether the climate has changed at all in the past four thousand years, but in general scholars believe that the climate cannot have been markedly different, and we have now enough evidence to enable us to plot with some confidence the vegetation zones of the ancient world. Yet such maps are rare, or more usually absent, in Biblical atlases; maps of land use are very uncommon; and any consideration of structure entirely lacking.

It may be argued, of course, that all this information is marginal to Biblical history, but this is quite untrue, and even if it should prove to be true in any part, this cannot be known in advance of the facts. We have learned, and quite rightly, not to come to the archaeological evidence with minds already clouded by pre-determined concepts of what is useful, and we must approach the geographical data with the same expectant impartiality. Only after we know what the facts are have we the right to ask whether they throw any light upon the Biblical literature. Thus marsh and basalt are nowhere mentioned in the Bible, unless the 'iron stone' of Deut. 8: 9 is basalt, as some have suggested, but we know them to have been so forbidding that all roads avoided absolutely the areas of permanent swamp and the vast stretches of desert *harrah*. Yet no present Biblical atlas pays attention to this, or shows the remarkable volcanic barrier on the eastern plateau. Routes in Palestine often lay along the valleys of soft chalk, but not along the far more precipitous clefts in the harder limestone, and the Cenomanian limestone normally carries a thicker vegetation cover than any other Palestinian rock. Knowledge of the underlying geology therefore helps us to plot with greater accuracy the ancient routes and the distribution of now vanished forests.

The tribal districts, most of which bear essentially regional names, reflect the different types of farming practised in the country; the major international trade routes were mainly piedmont routes following the oases at the foot of the mountains; the wanderings of the Patriarchs lay almost entirely in that steppeland region with between 200 and 400 mm. (8-16 inches) of average annual rainfall; the trans-desert trade with distant Sheba in south-western Arabia depended upon the fact that the maximum rainfall in northern Arabia is in winter, whereas in south-western Arabia it tends to come in summer. These are but a selection of the facts which suggest that if a Bible is to be published with maps (and the sooner maps are regarded as a necessary accompaniment to the Bible, the better), then climatic maps ought certainly to be included.

Furthermore, maps ought not to be lumped together at the end of the

Bible, as is the present practice. Historical maps would surely be more helpful if they appeared at appropriate places in the historical books, and maps to illustrate the basic facts of the geographical environment should surely come at the beginning. Not only would this be more convenient, but it would help to emphasize what many people find hard to comprehend, that the Biblical documents concern real events, taking place in a real country, which was intimately, and indeed intricately, related to the countries which surrounded it. If there were maps, not merely of Palestine, but of the whole Middle East, these would illustrate the extraordinary variety of environments in the Biblical world. They would help to explain why there are 'gods many and lords many', and why so much of ancient Israelite history was the coming to terms with ways of life utterly different from their own, a prolonged and complex history which was absolutely necessary if they were to be able to assert, *out of their own experience*, that there could be no other God but Yahweh.

In the light of these suggestions of what Biblical maps ought to show, it may perhaps be valuable to examine what is at present available to teachers, and to those concerned with the publication of new editions, or new translations, of the Bible, who might wish to make use of such maps in their work. They are listed here according to the date of publication, and the discussion is limited to the maps, and does not deal normally with the accompanying text.

The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible, edited by George Ernest Wright and Floyd Vivian Filson (Westminster, Philadelphia, 1946; Revised edition 1956). To this belongs the honour of being the first of the new series of Biblical atlases, and its chief value was the more accurate identification of sites, for which the editors had the assistance of W. F. Albright. Unfortunately, the strange method of showing relief often obscures the true relationship of these sites to the physical features, and there are as well serious geographical errors. The Dead Sea is shown extending about 25 miles too far south; the relief south of Beersheba bears little relation to the actual contours, the wadi lines are incorrect, the great 'cauldrons' of the area nowhere appear, and the important Wadi Murra gap and the great fault scarp overlooking the Rift Valley are absent. On the other side of the Rift there is no means of discerning that the plateau edge in Edom surpasses 5,000 feet, and presents a tremendous wall to the west. The River Jabbok is not shown rising, as in fact it does, at Rabboth Ammon, 'the city of waters'; the sharp division between Upper and Lower Galilee is not made clear; and the roads often bear little relation to the relief features. The geographical differences between Judah and Samaria are completely obscured, and indeed the text states, falsely, that Judah is lower than Samaria (p. 19). There are no climatic or other environmental maps.

Atlas of the Bible,¹ by Luc H. Grollenberg (Nelson, London and New York, 1956). Beautifully illustrated, this has good claim to be the most attractive of all the recent atlases, but unfortunately it is out of print in the USA. The relief is shown by layer colouring, and is based on the detailed surveys made on both sides of the Jordan. It is therefore admirably accurate,

¹ Translated from the Dutch. Ed.

though it is confined on most maps to the Palestinian area, extending to just south of the Dead Sea. Edom and the Negeb are thus excluded, except for small-scale, and much less exact, maps. The map of the Exodus, for instance, colours all Edom a monotone brown, and gives no indication of the dramatic ending of the high plateau at Ras en-Neqb, though the 1:250,000 map of this area was certainly available well before the book was published. There is a valuable map of the whole Levant Coast to show the wanderings of the Patriarchs, and this also shows the rainfall, though it is the only map to give any climatic information. As with the *Westminster Atlas*, the maps of the larger Middle East are too generalized to be of real value. Routes are shown only on the map of New Testament Palestine, and here, alas, entirely disregard the carefully delineated relief. Errors include the coastal road from Ptolemais to Caesarea shown as crossing the summit of Carmel, the road from Damascus to Samaria coming down the canyon of the Yarmuq, the road from the coast to Jerusalem climbing straight up the hillside, and the main north-south road east of the Jordan running along the side of the plateau escarpment. There are no vegetation maps, but the numerous historical maps are of considerable value. In connection with this atlas should be mentioned two companion volumes, though they are not strictly speaking Biblical atlases: *Atlas of the Early Christian World*, by F. Van der Meer and Christine Mohrmann, and *Atlas of Mesopotamia*, by Martin A. Beek, both published by Nelson. Grollenberg's *Shorter Atlas of the Bible*¹ (Nelson, 1959) has an interesting text and admirable photographs, but the maps are a poor substitute for those of the bigger volume.

Rand McNally Bible Atlas, by Emil G. Kraeling (Rand McNally, New York, 1956). In contrast to those just discussed, these maps are unquestionably the worst to appear in any major Biblical atlas. There are twenty-two maps in colour, on all but one of which the relief is only vaguely shown. The exception is Map II, called a 'Physiographic Map of Ancient Palestine.' This has no key, and one must guess what the colours mean. Apparently the green is vegetation, since it is certainly not lowland, but if so, then the map appears to portray an eschatological reversal of present fact. The deserts of the lower Jordan Valley, and the Wilderness of Judaea, as well as the barren lee-slopes of the Anti-Lebanon, are thickly forested, while the seaward side of Lebanon and the headland of Carmel are brown and desolate. The course of the River Jabbok is quite wrong, and so is the line of the upper Arnon. The Zerqa Ma'in, which enters the Dead Sea at Callirhoe, and the Kerak Wadi from Kir Hareseth, are omitted entirely, but a wholly imaginary stream flows into the Dead Sea from the south. This last is remarkably persistent, but the courses of many other rivers vary from map to map. On most maps the Wadi Wala, a tributary of the Arnon, is shown wrongly as rising near Rabboth Ammon, but by Map XXII ('Palestine Today') desiccation has proceeded apace, and the Arnon and Zered are merely intermittent. The Jabbok, on the other hand, boldly rises far out into the desert, altogether off the map. Towns are very carelessly sited. Babylon appears in three different locations (Maps XII, XIX, XXI) and Pergamum in two (XX, XXI), Ctesiphon is wrongly shown on the River

¹ Originally published in Dutch. Ed.

Diyala (XIII); Dibon consistently appears too far north of the Arnon, and the road from Kir Hareseth to the Dead Sea is impossible.

The *Bible Atlas* is redeemed by its text, which gives a great deal of sound archaeological information, and by many of the photographs. This does not apply, however, to the geographical information in Chapter II, which has many errors of fact, and some faulty diagrams. The Jordan Rift Valley is shown above sea-level (!), and the rainfall map of page 38 is totally wrong, and bears no relation at all to the relief.

Oxford Bible Atlas, edited by Herbert G. May (Oxford, 1962). This is certainly the best value for money at the time of writing. It is beautifully printed, with exceptional clarity, and the siting of towns and villages is extremely careful. There are better maps of the whole Middle East than appear in any other atlas, though all maps have that somewhat indeterminate method of showing relief, of which for some reason the Oxford cartographers are so proud. There is a good rainfall map of the Palestinian area, though this does not extend to Edom, but no other rainfall maps. The map entitled 'Vegetation in Biblical Times' is based directly, and uncritically, on the *Atlas of Israel* map of the Palestinian landscape in the nineteenth century, with one or two quite inexplicable alterations, such as showing the south of the Trans-Jordan plateau with less vegetation than it had in recent times. The boundary of the Palestinian forest area does not coincide, as it undoubtedly should, with the summit of the hill-country. There is no further environmental information, and the usefulness of the map of ancient trade routes is lessened by the fact that they are very generalized and disregard the relief.

The Macmillan Bible Atlas, by Yohanan Aharoni and Michael Avi-Yonah (Macmillan, New York, 1968). This most recent atlas is essentially a translation of the two volume atlas of Jewish history published by Carta in Jerusalem, the first volume being reproduced almost without alteration, while room has been made for maps of the New Testament and the early Church by the omission of certain maps from the second volume. The names of the two authors are a guarantee of thoroughness, and this is by far the most complete and detailed historical atlas of the ancient history of Palestine to appear in English. It includes, among many others, maps illustrating the Egyptian execration texts, the campaigns of the Pharaohs, every Old Testament battle, trade under Solomon, the inter-testamental period, and the events of the New Testament. It is an invaluable work of reference, and no Biblical student can afford to be without it.

However, by no manner of means does it do all that the publishers so extravagantly claim for it on the jacket, for it is concerned with Palestinian history far more than with geography, or than with the surrounding countries, and much of the detail is, it must be admitted, open to question. It is a pity that these detailed maps, printed in black over a monotone relief base, should show that relief so ineffectively, and that the maps of battles should sometimes apparently disregard the relief. The maps of the Middle East are altogether too general, and occasionally inaccurate, e.g. in showing a major highway following the Tigris north of Nineveh. Surely also one must now identify all the rivers of the Garden of Eden with Mesopotamian

streams, and not place two of them in the swamps of the southern Sudan. There are three maps of the economy of Palestine and the Middle East, but no rainfall map with which these could be compared. Furthermore, the literalism in interpreting the Biblical records, which is fashionable today among some Israeli scholars, is bound to limit the value of this atlas for use among American and European students. Is it really legitimate, for instance, to include a map of Samson carrying the gates of Gaza to Hebron, and maps showing so exactly how Jesus went to Nain, or from Capernaum to the Mount of Transfiguration, which is identified with Mount Tabor? Some of the routes proposed for the New Testament are very odd, and one must wonder upon what evidence the authors assert that Philip baptized the Ethiopian Eunuch just outside Jerusalem, or why they took Jesus so confidently on a journey through Dion and Abila east of the Jordan! The weakness of such detailed historical reconstruction is that it is apt to set down as fact more than we have authority to say.

BARCLAY M. NEWMAN

SOMETHING NEW FOR SOMETHING OLD

An Axiom and its Application

'No one can explain, by himself, a prophecy of Scripture', wrote the author of 2 Peter. What he meant, of course, was that no one could properly understand any passage of Scripture apart from its setting in the life, thought, and history of the believing community; and any attempt to do so was playing into the hands of false teachers. Not all people have followed this sound advice, but perhaps the most notorious of those who have done otherwise was the heretic Marcion, who came to Rome about A.D. 140. From reading the Pauline writings he concluded that the God of wrath and vengeance spoken of in the Old Testament was in no wise the same God of love and forgiveness referred to in the Pauline writings. Therefore, Marcion rejected the entire Old Testament and most of the New Testament, accepting only the Pauline epistles (exclusive of the pastorals) along with a pruned edition of the Gospel of Luke.

What Marcion did has been duplicated, on a much smaller scale, by well-intentioned translators from time to time. How does the translator do this grievous thing? Every time he attempts to force the interpretation of one Gospel upon another, to harmonize, to add basically irrelevant material, or to skew data according to his own particular theological orientation, he becomes guilty of this sin. Perhaps no translator can be absolutely free from wrongly rendering some passage in the course of his work, but errors can be brought to a minimum by following the axiom set out in 2 Peter 1: 21. That is, *in translating one must seek to understand the historical, cultural, linguistic, and theological settings of the Biblical passage under consideration.*