



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

follow the developing social life, its interests, needs, and problems and show how their satisfaction, solution, or frustration produced the characteristic religious forms and beliefs of the people. Only so is it possible to understand their joy in a religion different from that of other peoples. This probably accounts for the fact that the author condemns some things and often regrets that other religions did not achieve the exalted ideas of God and salvation attained in Christianity. The reason is in the social situation and the task of the historian of religion is to understand it.

Professor Soper has chosen deliberately to give to his book an apologetic cast in the interest of Christianity as he interprets it. His philosophic presupposition is that God has been progressively revealing himself to the peoples as they were able to receive the truth and that he has revealed himself most completely in Jesus Christ. There can be no objection to this position if one is writing apologetics. It is just so that modern Buddhist and Moslem writers are presenting their own religions. But for all things there is a time—a time for apologetics and a time for history of religions. They do not belong together. The sacred duty of the scientific student of religions is not to pity, nor to preach, nor to condemn, but to understand and to interpret. And yet, in spite of its apologetics, which may indeed commend it to the general reader, the Christian pastor, and beginning students to whom it is addressed, the book is a welcome addition to the literature of the science.

A. EUSTACE HAYDON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ISRAEL AND EGYPT¹

This is the work of a busy pastor in Glasgow. The amount of labor that has gone into the making of this book is amazing. Mr. Knight has read almost everything of importance upon the subject and he has reported his reading accurately. The care that is shown in the proof-reading is typical of the whole work. The book is a veritable mine of information upon Egypt and Palestine and will constitute a monument to the diligence of the author.

The historical value of this book is open to serious question. The reviewer will not concern himself with its contribution to the history of Egypt, except to point out that Mr. Knight takes Petrie as his guide for

¹ *Nile and Jordan. An Archaeological History of the Inter-Relations between Egypt and Palestine from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.* G. A. Frank Knight. London: James Clarke and Co., 1921. xii+572 pages. 5 maps. 36s.

the most part and consequently adopts the longer chronology. For example, he places the beginning of the First Dynasty at 5510 B.C., in contrast to Erman, Meyer, Breasted, *et al.*, who put it at about 3500 B.C. He follows Hommel in making Egyptian civilization to have originated in Babylonia, whence it was brought to Egypt by Semitic invaders, who were in turn conquered by the Egyptians to whom, however, the Semites taught the arts of civilization.

In the field of Hebrew history, there can be no serious difference of judgment on the part of historical students as to the slight value of Mr. Knight's treatment. It is innocent of any knowledge of historical method. There is no sharp discrimination in the evaluation of sources. The Chronicler ranks high as a credible historian. The Targum, Josephus, Manetho, the Apocrypha, and the Apostle Stephen all come in for recognition as witnesses to the history of the ancient world and are given much weight as preserving ancient traditions. The Song of Songs furnishes "facts" as to Solomon. All is grist to Mr. Knight's mill. The plagues recorded in Exodus actually happened as there related. The tabernacle of the Priestly Code was an actual building as described. The story of Joseph, including the episode with Potiphar's wife, is literally true as told. It is refreshing after wandering so long in uncertainty about early Hebrew chronology, to turn to Mr. Knight's table and find that Isaac was born in 2065 B.C., Abraham died in 1990 B.C., Moses was born in 1525 B.C., the Exodus occurred in 1445 B.C., Moses died in 1405 B.C., and David was born in 1039 B.C. and died in 969 B.C. The "Pharaoh of the Oppression" was Thothmes III and Amenhotep II was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Queen Hatshepset was the daughter of Pharaoh who saved the life of the infant Moses.

One end that Mr. Knight had in view in writing this book was to stress the influence exerted by Egypt upon the life and thought of the Hebrews. This is a perfectly proper purpose and is in the main right. It is practically certain that the influence of Egypt upon Hebrew life has so far been underestimated. But Mr. Knight overdoes the matter. He sees Egyptian influence where there is no reason to see it. For example, why must Job's longing for a record of his words inscribed upon the rock be connected with the rock-inscriptions of Egypt? Was not the rock of Behistun known to the Hebrews of that day? The Assuan colony had an Aramaic copy of the Behistun inscription. Were there not rock-cut inscriptions in Sinai and on the Dog River? Again, why must Job's reference to "clay under the seal" argue for Egyptian influence? Was not the seal well known in Palestine itself, to say nothing of the clay tablets and the seals of Babylonia? When Job says, "Oh,

that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat!" must we see an Egyptian background? Were gods enthroned only in Egypt? The Code of Hammurabi, for example, represents Shamash, the sun-god, as seated upon his throne delivering the laws to the king. Is it to be supposed that contemporary Persian or Greek god were never thought of as sitting down? Need we go abroad at all to account for Yahweh's being thought of as seated upon a throne? Such claims as these weaken an otherwise good case. In so far as Mr. Knight succeeds in impressing upon his readers the fact that the relations between the life of Egypt and the life of Palestine were continuous and intimate, his work will be of service in enlightening the present age regarding the unity of the civilization of the ancient oriental world.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A NEW THEORY OF GOSPEL ORIGINS¹

Mr. Robinson Smith's solution of the Synoptic Problem, as readers of his earlier publications know, is the simple one "that Luke followed on after Matthew and used him as a source, even as Matthew followed on after Mark and used him as a source." To the demonstration and elaboration of this thesis, with related investigations, the present volume is dedicated. There are five main lines of argument, summarily presented in the first chapter. Proof 1, which Mr. Smith seems to regard as most telling, consists of a list of twenty-two passages in Mark, of which Matthew in eighteen cases chose the first part and Luke the second, or what was left after Matthew had had "first choice." Proof 2 consists in over one hundred and fifty passages in which Luke "consciously or unconsciously" agrees with Matthew in the latter's alterations of his Markan source. Only a half dozen of these are given; for the rest reference is made to E. A. Abbott's *Corrections of Mark*, and to Sir John Hawkins. Proof 3 is the citation of nineteen passages in which Luke seems to change further Matthew's changes from Mark. Proof 4 is based on eleven passages in which Luke pieces together a detail from Mark and a detail from Matthew. Proof 5 consists of four doublets in Luke, one of which comes from Mark, the other, says Mr. Smith, from Matthew.

If these five lines of proof could be substantiated, without discount, they would indeed make a very strong case. But a careful examination

¹ *The Solution of the Synoptic Problem*. Robinson Smith. London: Watts and Co., 1920. 10s. net.