evaporation (see Ezek. xlvii, 10), viz., up to about 13,000 km. (= 4,800 square miles), an increase corresponding to one-fifth of the recent area. With an efficient head of not more than 200 m. (= 656 feet) the plant would produce more than 40,000 H.P."

Mr. Hiorth points out that this power would be utilized in various different ways which he specifies (plant, works, fish nurseries, etc., etc.), and estimates the cost of the tunnelling at nearly £8,000,000.

"To this amount should be added the cost of the power-plant, the factories, canals, and other works for the irrigation and the salt works. The interest on and the amortisation of a capital of about £12,000,000 must be divided amongst all these concerns. If the technical works (saltpetre, salt, distribution of electric power, etc.) are charged with one half of this amount, and the other half be charged to the forestry, the agriculture, and the horticulture, a rough estimate, founded on the very insufficient data that are as yet available, would show that this plan does not compare at all unfavourably with the irrigation-works constructed in Asia and America during the last decade."

It may be added that the *Aberdeen Free Press* (Aug. 4th) in a review of the pamphlet, states: "It is a fresh and arresting scheme. The capital required is large, but the Jewish community throughout the world could, if it were so minded, put up the sum mentioned with ease. Whether or not this particular project is feasible is a technical question."

We agree with the last sentence. The subject is not one which the *Quarterly Statement* can discuss. The reviewer of the earlier pamphlet sees no reason for modifying his verdict on the scheme, the merits of which can now be estimated by others.

KEDESH-NAPHTALI AND TAANACH: A THEORY AND SOME COMMENTS.

By Stanley A. Cook, M.A.

Prof. Julian Morgenstein, of the Hebrew Union College, U.S.A., discusses in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January and April, 1919, the question of Kedesh-Naphtali and Taanach in Judges

chaps. iv and v. He argues against the not uncommon view that the two chapters really refer to one battle, and draws attention to several important differences between them. Moreover, he states that chap. iv is quite confused in its account of the actual site of the battle. One version places it at Kedesh-Naphtali, and this is in agreement with Josh. chap. xi, whereas another locates the battle on the banks of the Kishon, just below Mount Tabor, and this is evidently an attempt to harmonize the account of the battle of Taanach, Judg. chap. v, with the battle of Kedesh-Naphtali of Judg. chap. iv and Josh. chap. xi, and to make them appear as one battle. Prof. Morgenstein further notes certain geographical inconsistencies, which suggest that the author, or authors, of this attempt were none too well acquainted with the topography of the Kishon Valley.

His view that Judg. chap. iv is a composite narrative is confirmed, he thinks, by the lists of the tribes who did and who did not participate in the battle. These lists become entirely explicable if we consider the geographical distribution of the tribes and the nature of the threat. He reaches the conclusion that in ancient Israel there were two confederations, each consisting of three contiguous tribes, one north of the Kishon Valley and one in Central Palestine. These groups had been separated by the Kishon Valley, which was in possession of the powerful Canaanite city-states situated there, and a common danger impelled the groups to unite.

> "Had the Canaanites gained the victory instead of Israel, it is impossible to even imagine what the results might have been. Certainly Judaism would never have evolved; and, without Judaism and its daughter religions, Christianity and Islam, the history of mankind would have been vastly different. Truly civilization was hanging in the balance at this moment, and the battle of Taanach may well be regarded as one of the most decisive battles of history."

Prof. Morgenstein points out that, in David's time, the southern federation of Israelite states was cut off from free relations with the northern groups by Canaanite possession of a stretch of land extending from Jerusalem on the east to Gezer on the west. David's conquest of Jerusalem and of the Philistines led to the formation of the nation of Israel. Once more a common interest and a common danger from a common enemy united two federated groups of tribes.

He considers that the battle of Kedesh-Naphtali preceded that of Taanach, though by how long it is impossible to determine. Nor can one determine who led the Israelites against Jabïn, except that he must have been a member of the tribe of Zebulun or Naphtali. At all events, the battle broke the power of the Canaanite city-states in the Galilean highlands and permanently established those two tribes. Similarly the victory at Taanach broke the Canaanite power in the valley of the Kishon. The capture of Jerusalem by David caused the greater part of the southern Canaanite strip to pass into Israelite hands, although Gezer, on the western edge, held out until the reign of Solomon (1 Kings ix, 15). Shechem and Gibeon, other Canaanite strongholds, were apparently absorbed gradually in Israel (Josh. chap. ix, Judg. chap. ix, 1 Sam. chap. xxi). "In this way, it would seem, the greater part of Canaan passed finally into Israelite possession."

Prof. Morgenstein's discussion is a good example of the way in which a closer study of Palestinian topography contributes to the Biblical narratives, in this particular instance, by bringing to light a number of topographical difficulties and inconsistencies which admit of an explanation if we may assume that there has been some combination of distinct narratives or versions, such as we often find in Oriental literature outside the Bible. Prof. Morgenstein's theory is a development of one that is already familiar in the works of Profs. G. F. Moore, G. A. Cooke, F. C. Burney, and others; and it is of special interest on account of the way in which he associates a Canaanite enclave separating the central from the northern tribes with the similar one which severed the southern tribes from the central. This point demands further consideration.

The Biblical *facts* are such, that from Judg. chap. i, and other references, we are entitled to assume that two lines of Canaanite places separated the central tribes from those lying to the north and the south respectively. Unambiguous references in the Books of Samuel force the view that Jerusalem and its district did not become Israelite until the time of David; but when the northern Canaanite enclave became Israelite, is already discussed by Prof. Morgenstein. On the other hand, the account of the "northern campaign" in Josh. chap. xi, together with the general tenor of the Book of Joshua, would allow no room for the northern enclave; and, in like manner, the "southern campaign" in Josh.

chap. x, together with the tenor of the book and the relations between Judah and Benjamin in 1 Samuel, appear to make a southern enclave out of the question.

Much ingenuity has been expended in the attempt to weave all the difficult and conflicting details into some more or less consecutive history, but with no result that can be accepted. Indeed, it has to be recognised candidly that our history-books, which endeavour to present the reader with some fairly intelligible and simple account—whether the books are what are called "conservative," "moderate," or "radical"—succeed in this only by obscuring some of the difficulties, by selecting, on various grounds, what appear to be the most "historical" or "authentic" details, and by rejecting all that conflict with them. The synthesis is incomplete because of these omissions which it does not explain, and yet it is impossible to see how all the data can be accepted.

The students or ordinary readers who accept the Old Testament, as it stands, with its apparently plain historical views and religious thread, are perfectly right in insisting upon that unity which the work of criticism destroys. On the other hand, the work of analysis and of penetrating criticism—whether it be literary, historical, textual, psychological, etc.—is in every way legitimate and indispensable. The misfortune is that no complete comprehensive or synthetic view has been presented which commands the general assent of all concerned. The work of "criticism" usually does not bring out the religious and immediate value of the Old Testament in a way that appeals to ordinary readers, and to those who take the Book as a whole; but the latter, in their turn, usually ignore the thousand and one details of greater or less importance which are vital for any closer understanding of the Book from a more scholarly or critical point of view.

Clearly the task is not to agree to this existing schism between the religious and intellectual aspects; the more the religious and other aspects are kept severed and run their own different ways, the more is each likely to suffer. Harmony between them means a harmony between the individual's own religious and other conceptions, and the more this harmony is a natural one, doing justice to all the religious needs of men, the better is it for men's whole personality, and therefore for research itself. In other words a method of Biblical study that would answer the direct personal needs—the religious and all the various intellectual needs—would be

of enormous importance, inasmuch as it would involve a harmonising of religious and non-religious points of view.

Not only do we need this harmony—it is as necessary for life as it is for the future of thought—but actual political conditions are bringing in a new stage in the lengthy history of Bible-lands. Not to speak of Zionism and the establishment of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem; it is easy to see, on a little reflection, how questions of Palestine and of the Bible can at once become more real and living than before. Men of Western education have been, and will be, brought more into touch with Biblical topography, history, antiquities, and so forth. Is it not easy to imagine, for example, how an intelligent reader, with the Book of Judges before him, could discover for himself the difficulties which have confronted the stay-at-home students of the past? Is it not easy, also, to realise how, at the same time, men will be struck by the similarity of local colour, custom, topographical factors, and so on? In this way one can readily perceive how there may be two contending tendencies—the one to see merely error, the other to see nothing but truth, so that the Bible as a whole will be at once "proved" entirely unhistorical or triumphantly confirmed, as the case may be, unless there is a more reasoned view of its many-sidedness.

It is on these grounds, therefore, that we may realize how the new stage in the history of the Holy Land, due to the war and its sequel, may be full of meaning for the future study of the Bible. It may force a new stage in the study itself: it is at least perfectly true that important developments in this direction had already been showing themselves. But this is not the place to enlarge upon what those developments might or should be. There is however just one point which, as it arises out of Prof. Morgenstein's article, may be appropriately mentioned.

A large section of the internal difficulties in the Old Testament can be ascribed, not merely to "composition," to a combination of different narratives or versions, but to distinct historical perspectives. We already know that Israelites and Canaanites intermingled, and we can imagine how Israelites could take over Canaanite traditions and myths. But wherever there were cases of intermingling later in the history, there was always the possibility that traditions of the past would be transferred from one section of the people to the other. When the northern tribes went into captivity and the Samaritans took their place, the latter often claimed to be descen-

dants of the Joseph tribes, and would regard their traditions as their own, and they identified themselves with the history of their new home.

Again, when the Jews returned from exile, they found many of their brethren whose forefathers had always remained in the land; obviously, the latter would have a view of the past very different from that of those who returned. The northern and southern kingdoms were often at enmity; needless to say, this would affect the ideas each had of the other, and the way each regarded the other's history. So, not to pursue this further, if we consider the Biblical facts themselves touching the vicissitudes of the people, we shall be prepared to understand how different tribes or sections might have different groups of traditions, versions or historical perspectives, so that there may be cases where two versions conflict, but really represent rival statements or different *bonâ fide* recollections of the same events, or different and genuine outlooks upon the past.

It is not now argued that this will explain the particular difficulties in Judg. chaps. iv and v, but it is suggested that, by further attention to the points of view, the interests, colour, and general tendencies of the narratives, we can often find a natural way of understanding difficulties and inconsistencies, and we shall be employing a method the nature of which is self-evident if we consider how, at the present age, there are often different, if not conflicting versions, of the same events, or rival or conflicting attitudes to the same situation.

As already mentioned, there are prospects of the Holy Land becoming even better known to men of West European education and training. There may be greater opportunities of new and more intensive researches above and below ground; it seems appropriate, therefore, to call attention to what may seem in certain cases to explain inconsistencies or contradictions which cannot otherwise be resolved.