
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

their creed has to many the inspiration of a gospel. In this crisis 'the church is challenged as never before to speak the clear word and convict men of the supremacy of God over all human systems. What the Communists are trying to do by force and fear, we of the Christian Church must show can be done, and done far more effectively, by faith and love.'

This leads to the aspect of Christianity as an *adventure*. It is not a religion of escape, except in so far as it means an escape from the prison-house of self into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. 'When a man finds, and is found by, the stupendous Reality which is Christ, he discovers himself to be living in a new world.' He is now set free to serve Christ the King, and to help to build His Kingdom. This involves a high adventure both in Christian thinking and in Christian living. It works from within outwards. It means 'bringing every thought—and every deed, and every social custom, and every national and international relation—into captivity to the obedience of Christ.' An adventure fit to fire the enthusiasm of youth and try the strength of the stoutest heart.

Only the briefest reference can be made to the closing chapters, in which Christianity is presented as a *society* (the Church) and as a *victory*. The BISHOP closes with a striking illustration and appeal. 'Imagine some entirely remote island somewhere in the middle of the Pacific, and imagine, for the sake of argument, that this island had remained completely aloof from the world's life and the progress of civilization; the inhabitants' manners, morals, transport, and amenities belonging, shall we say, to the Stone Age. Then suppose that some one came among them and began to teach them what the twentieth-century world knows of wireless and flying, and the conquest of disease, and the beauty of the earth, and the wonders of literature, and the possibilities of a new and better kind of joint human living based on understanding and co-operation. As compared with their old outlook and habits and possibilities, the new way would seem to the inhabitants of this hypothetical island as sheer miracle; yet the one who taught them would know that all the good he was bringing them was not in the least irrational, but achieved simply by bringing higher and more wonderful laws of the universe into operation. Compared with Jesus, we are spiritually in the Stone Age. But He says to us, in effect, that there is no reason why we should not emerge from our ancient and gloomy prison-house, and live with Him in a realm, in an order of things, where the love of God operates freely and unimpeded for the good of humanity. He said, when He was on earth, and still says, in effect, that that day would come whenever men would together look at God through His eyes, and together lay hold of what God waits and longs to give. ***Why not Now and To-day?***'

Some Outstanding New Testament Problems.

II. 'L' and the Structure of the Lucan Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

BY J. M. CREED, D.D., ELY PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, CAMBRIDGE.

A LATE and an untrustworthy tradition makes the evangelist St. Luke a painter. We need not stay to consider the authenticity of the *icon* of the Virgin Mary ascribed to the evangelist which the Empress Eudocia is said to have sent to Pulcheria from Jerusalem, but we shall recognize an appropriateness in the legend: for of all the evangelists it is Luke who has provided the painters of Christendom with most of their favourite themes, and his Gospel abounds in scenes which portray

the Lord's Person and His message for mankind with a delicate skill and a not unconscious literary art which are closely allied to the creative gift of a great painter. The individual character of St. Luke's Gospel is no new discovery of modern scholarship. There are to-day readers not a few who, though they have no clear idea of the distinctive features of the Gospels of St. Matthew and of St. Mark, and no understanding of the Synoptic problem, will know that they must look to St. Luke for the story of the Annunciation, for the Parable of the Prodigal Son, and for the account of the journey to Emmaus. But the student who has been schooled in the critical method of the last hundred and fifty years has learned to look at the individual characteristics of St. Luke, as of the other Gospels, from a fresh angle, and he must needs ask questions which the scholars of an earlier age would have barely understood. For us the four Gospels are no longer four independent witnesses to one story. We know that the transmission of the Gospel tradition is a tangled story, and behind each of the four Gospels, with the possible exception of St. Mark, we can detect sources which appear again in one or more of the other members of the fourfold Gospel of the Church. Many questions remain unsolved, some are perhaps insoluble, often we must content ourselves—especially for the earliest stages of the tradition—with imaginative reconstructions as to how things may have happened. Such imaginings are by no means unprofitable, even though we may not often be able to pass from probable opinion to assured knowledge. But with regard to the transmission of the tradition certain conclusions stand clear above our doubts: first, Mark has been used by Matthew, by Luke, and, in a less direct way, by John; secondly, both Matthew and Luke have used in common another Greek documentary source, consisting mainly of Sayings of the Lord. When we reflect that Matthew and Luke are undoubtedly independent each of the other, the extent of their agreement both in the scope of their work and in the sources which they used, affords striking testimony to the condition of the tradition at the time when they wrote, as well as in the period which immediately preceded their literary activity. A good case has been made out for ascribing the Gospel of Matthew to Antioch and dating it about the ninth decade of the first century. With rather less assurance we may conjecture that the Lucan Gospel was produced in Rome and at about the same period. These two Gospels may be taken, then, to establish the fact that in the decades following the Jewish War and the capture of Jerusalem the same documentary version of the Lord's sayings (perhaps with editorial variation) was an established authority in at least two different Christian centres, and that in these same Churches the Gospel of Mark was the standard version of the ministry of Jesus. We may also infer that at the period when Matthew and Luke were written, Mark and Q, though authoritative, are not sacrosanct. Still less is exclusive authority claimed for them, or for any set of documents. The age of the closed Canon is not yet. The living voice of tradition is still to be heard, and other records of the words and deeds of the Lord, some of them at least in documentary form, are at hand. Both evangelists have freely supplemented the two sources which they have in common, and Luke, especially in the concluding narratives, has treated Mark with considerable liberty. Although each evangelist has filled out Mark in a remarkably similar fashion—prefixing stories of the birth of Jesus, amplifying the narrative of the Passion, and appending narratives of appearances of the Risen Lord—it is to be observed that with the exception of the matter which may be traced to Q, the great bulk of the non-Marcan material in Matthew and in Luke is not only different in the two Gospels, but wholly independent. Thus the birth narratives of the two Gospels betray no point of literary contact, and in the Passion narratives Matthew and Luke coincide only in so far as they are both dependent upon Mark. The issue is not quite so plain with regard to the Matthæan and Lucan parables, and it is not always possible to be sure how much should be taken back to Q; yet here, too, in each Gospel there is a considerable body of material which has no parallel elsewhere.

'The presumption that in the matter peculiar to Matthew and peculiar to Luke we have the latest literary stratum,' says Wellhausen, 'is self-explanatory.' It remains, of course, a presumption. It is always possible that one evangelist depends upon a valuable line of tradition distinct from Mark and Q and equally primitive which the other did not know, or, it may be, decided to ignore, and this possibility must be tested. On the whole, and with an important reservation which makes the subject of this paper, I think it would be true to say that the history of criticism has not greatly encouraged the view that an early non-Marcan narrative Gospel can be detected behind the Canonical Gospels, though it is certain that non-Marcan traditions of events of the Lord's life were current both before and after Mark's Gospel came

into circulation. With regard to Discourse material peculiar to Matthew and peculiar to Luke, it is necessary to speak with more reserve: there is much to favour the belief that each evangelist has drawn upon special written sources, in part at any rate, early in date and relatively primitive in character.

I now turn to a very interesting theory of the sources and structure of St. Luke's Gospel, which has obtained wide currency during the last few years both in Britain and in America, thanks largely to Canon Streeter's attractive and persuasive advocacy in his great book *The Four Gospels*. It will be seen that for those who accept it, the perspective of the transmission of the Gospel tradition as I have just sketched it needs considerable modification; Canon Streeter, indeed, claims that it amounts to a 'Copernican revolution.' I must refer my readers to ch. 8 of *The Four Gospels* (Macmillan, 1924); also to Dr. Vincent Taylor's careful and detailed elaboration of Canon Streeter's view in *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford, 1926), and his more recent defence of the position in his latest book *Formations of the Gospel Tradition* (Macmillan, 1933). Among other scholars who have accepted Streeter's view more or less decidedly are B. S. Easton and T. W. Manson. In this year's Conference number of *The Modern Churchman* (October, 1934), Canon Streeter has reaffirmed his adherence to the theory, though it is to be noted that his interpretation as here given shows him to be unwilling to adopt the more radical form of the doctrine espoused by Dr. Vincent Taylor.

Briefly, Streeter's view is that, while the Canonical Gospel of Luke undoubtedly makes use of Mark, there is reason to think that Luke himself habitually preferred another non-Marcan source, and that the Marcan material in the Gospel should be regarded as a secondary interpolation into an earlier draft, which he appropriately calls Proto-Luke. Streeter suggests that 'Proto-Luke' may well have been an earlier work by the evangelist himself; that at a later date Luke came across Mark and used it to 'enrich' this earlier and independent work. Now if Luke is rightly looked at from this angle, the results, as Streeter points out, are of very considerable importance, for, although Mark remains a source common to Matthew and Luke, the *prima facie* importance of this fact in the history of the tradition is greatly diminished if Mark can be shown to have been brought in as an afterthought in the Lucan Gospel. Moreover, 'Proto-Luke,' *i.e.* the Canonical Gospel (apart from chs. 1 and 2) less the Marcan 'enrichments,' becomes an independent authority for the Gospel story, more or less co-ordinate with Mark, and perhaps somewhat earlier in date.

My purpose in this article is to encourage my readers to examine this matter further before they accept Streeter's conclusion. In the brief space which is here allowed me I cannot hope to examine the evidence in full detail. I may be allowed to refer to my treatment of the question in the edition of St. Luke's Gospel which was published four years ago (Macmillan, 1930). Perhaps I may also say to some of my English critics who have expressed the opinion that I dealt too cavalierly with the Proto-Lucan doctrine, that if they will work through the notes, especially those on the Passion narrative, they will find there detailed arguments to support the opinions which I state summarily in the Introduction. I have weighed carefully the criticisms of this part of my commentary, and it is my considered opinion that the arguments which I brought forward in my book stand firm. But I must here interpose a word of explanation. If 'the Proto-Luke hypothesis' is merely used as a phrase to cover the very common theory that Q, as Luke knew it, was already combined with some of the material peculiar to Luke, I am not at all concerned to dispute it. This hypothesis undoubtedly gives a good explanation of why Luke, in the body of his Gospel, put narratives which he probably regarded as doublets of Marcan narratives in a non-Marcan setting. There are also other points in its favour; and I think it may well be true. But when Dr. Vincent Taylor, for instance, speaks of Proto-Luke, he generally—though not quite always—means the much more comprehensive theory which he shares with Canon Streeter, that Q incorporated with narrative material extending from the beginning of the ministry to the Passion and the Resurrection is the foundation document of Luke; that the Marcan material is a secondary addition; and that the removal of the Marcan texts leaves us with an independent non-Marcan source for the whole compass of the Gospel. It is 'the Proto-Luke hypothesis' as thus understood that I question.

As Taylor recognizes, the Lucan Passion narrative is the crucial point on which the Proto-Luke theory must make its footing good. In the rest of the Gospel the Marcan and the non-Marcan elements are for the most part distinct. Whether we think with Hawkins and most critics of non-Marcan interpolations into a Marcan framework, or with Streeter and his disciples of Marcan interpolations into a Proto-Lucan framework, the fact remains that it is possible to say of most of the material

in the body of the Gospel that it is, or is not, Marcan. In the Passion narrative it is agreed that Marcan and non-Marcan elements lie side by side in a single continuous narrative. The relation of the finished Lucan text to the Marcan source is best studied in this admittedly composite narrative. In *The Four Gospels*, p. 202, Streeter summarizes some important observations made by Sir John Hawkins on the differences between the Lucan and the Marcan narratives of the Passion, showing that even where the matter in Luke is closely parallel to the matter in Mark, the Lucan wording, except in certain selected verses, differs from the Marcan much more decidedly than in other Marcan passages in the Gospel; and, further, that whereas the non-Marcan material in Matthew is detachable from the context, the non-Marcan material in Luke is closely woven into the structure of the narrative. Streeter continues: 'The conclusion to which these facts point Sir John himself hesitates to draw. It is that Luke is in the main reproducing an account of the Passion parallel to, but independent of, Mark, and enriching it with occasional insertions from Mark.' But it is precisely at this point that Sir John seems to me to be the surer guide, and it is worth while to notice that he had fully considered, and, on consideration, had rejected Feine's theory of a pre-canonical Luke, which is not essentially different from the Proto-Lucan doctrine which is now so fashionable. What if the Marcan materials be likewise found to be 'woven into the structure of the narrative'? In Streeter's conclusion which I have quoted, two assumptions are involved: (1) that the Marcan material is detachable from its content, and (2) that it is of such a character that it would be likely to appeal to an editor as an 'enrichment.' These assumptions must be tested.

Let the reader work through the list of indisputably Marcan verses in Luke, as given by Streeter and Taylor, and examine the matter for himself. He will find one passage, and, if I mistake not, one only (viz. 22^{19a}), where there is an attractive case for regarding the Marcan text as an insertion. He will find others which might be so interpreted if the rest of the evidence favoured the view (*e.g.* $23^{26.\ 34b.\ 44-45}$). But lastly he will find a residue of indisputably Marcan material which refuses to be classified as 'enrichment,' and which cannot be dissevered from the content. The most striking examples are in the narrative of the arrest ($22^{47.\ 50.\ 52-53}$). There are others in the accounts of the trials before the High Priest and before Pilate (22^{71}, 23^{3}). Some of these Marcan reminiscences are quite insignificant in substance, but they are for that reason the more weighty as evidence against the view that the Marcan material can be classified as 'occasional insertion.' Other Marcan parallels will be found in the Lucan account of the Last Supper and of the Crucifixion which, though less decisive than some of those which I have mentioned above, are not easily explicable in terms of 'enrichment.' It is disappointing to find that in his latest paper Canon Streeter has made no mention of these arguments which weigh so heavily against his view of the Passion narrative as he has stated it in *The Four Gospels*.

The statistical observations of Sir John Hawkins, which have been further admirably worked out with special reference to each paragraph by Taylor, are very interesting as showing that for whatever reason Luke follows his Marcan source far less closely here than in the body of the Gospel. But we have no right to assume *a priori* that Luke will always treat his Marcan source in the same way. As Dr. Hunkin has pointed out (*Journal of Theological Studies*, xxviii. 250–262) in ch. 21, where there is no sufficient reason to postulate a non-Marcan source, the proportion of non-Marcan words rises far above the average level. The Passion and the Resurrection are the crown of the gospel story, and it is quite reasonable to suppose that Luke considered it worth while to recast his material here more thoroughly than in the narratives of the Galilean ministry. The statistical observations may merely illustrate the fact that he has done so.

Here perhaps I ought to glance at another argument for the Proto-Luke hypothesis, since great stress has been laid upon it. It has been pointed out by Dr. Taylor that if the indubitably Marcan passages in the Lucan Passion narrative are taken in order, they preserve, with one exception, the original Marcan order, in spite of the fact that the Lucan narrative as a whole presents a number of differences in order from the Marcan. (If we add to Dr. Taylor's list, as I think we should, Lk 22^{71} = Mk 14^{64a} the exceptions rise to two.) The suggestion is that this agreement in order confirms the view that Luke is inserting fragments of Mark into an earlier non-Marcan draft. But it does not seem likely that, if Luke were proceeding in the manner Dr. Taylor supposes, he would feel any reluctance to vary the order of his Marcan insertions, if the general order which he preferred demanded it. On any theory the position of most of these Marcan texts was determined by the context, and the fact that the differences of order between the Marcan texts in Luke and the Marcan source are few in

number, merely illustrates the truth that most of the Lucan transpositions are relatively slight, and that the main order is the same in both Gospels. There appears, then, to be nothing here to weaken our confidence in the conclusion to which, as I have argued, the evidence directs us.

But though the evidence to which I have referred appears to be clear against the doctrine of Proto-Luke as it has been stated by Streeter and elaborated by Taylor, it by no means necessarily disposes of the hypothesis that Luke knew and used a second continuous source for the Passion narrative which he may be supposed to have conflated with Mark. Can we reach any certain conclusion as to whether, in fact, Luke did use such a continuous source? It appears to me that that possibility must be left open. At the same time, the more closely Luke's work is studied, the less likely does it appear to me to be. On the one hand we find traces of Mark at all the crucial points in the story, and sometimes when Luke incorporates quite new matter (*e.g.* in the journey to Emmaus) the material has been woven in with the Marcan tradition. And then, again, such passages as Lk $4^{16ff.}$, Ac 15, dispose one to make a generous allowance for Luke's own creative powers. It is seldom in the Passion narratives that the evidence warrants confident statement, but it is worth while to look at one place where it is possible to speak with assurance. The Lucan narrative of St. Peter's denials is so closely parallel to the Marcan that both Streeter and Taylor are satisfied that Mark is here Luke's only source. But at the end of this Marcan narrative, Luke, and Luke alone, relates that after the denials Peter catches the Lord's eye from within the palace, and that this recalls to him the prophecy of his downfall, which had been made in the Upper Room. This sublime conclusion could not have been taken from a separate source, for it is meaningless, apart from its content in the narrative, and this, otherwise, is wholly Marcan. It must therefore be Lucan embellishment of the Marcan text. The evangelist who was gifted with imagination of this order may be credited with the power of rewriting and reconstructing Mark elsewhere without the help of a parallel narrative.[1] Throughout chs. 22–24 Luke seems to me to be himself reshaping the familiar Marcan story, softening its harsh features, smoothing out improbabilities, and working in both traditions he has heard and the imaginings of his own mind, perhaps without a clear knowledge as to when he was reproducing and when he was creating.

When we turn to the body of the Gospel we find ourselves confronted with a large mass of material peculiar to Luke, and whereas with regard to the narratives of the Passion and Resurrection there is difference of opinion as to whether or not Luke is drawing upon a second continuous source, there is a fairly general consensus of scholars that for at least some parts of this material a written source (or sources) should be postulated. Without prejudging the questions as to the extent and homogeneity of Luke's special source, we may represent it by the symbol L. Some scholars—Dr. Easton among them—have used L to cover not only peculiar Lucan material in the centre of the Gospel, but the first two chapters as well. These chapters, however, appear to be so far distinct from the rest both in style and character that there is a strong case for the general practice of treating them separately, and here I leave them on one side. Confining ourselves, therefore, to chs. 3–21, I think we may be certain that Luke had some documentary source which contained a good many of the narratives and the parables peculiar to himself. It is noteworthy that some of the Lucan parables come now in a setting which is clearly not original. They must have come from somewhere else. Luke may himself have edited his source, he certainly did not create it.

Assuming that there was a document L, can anything certain be said as to its extent? We must be alive to the possibility that any given piece may have come from Q although it is not present in Matthew, and we must allow for the possibility that Luke is committing to writing some saying or incident himself for the first time. The only evidence at our disposal is internal. We must inquire whether we can find characteristics of vocabulary, style, and ideas common to parts or the whole of this material, and further, we must especially observe whether we can distinguish characteristics of L from characteristics of the evangelist himself. Some useful tables of words characteristic of Luke's peculiar matter will be found in the Introduction to Dr. Easton's Commentary. They should be supplemented by a reference to his articles in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vols. xxix. and xxx. Easton, very rightly as I think, tries to distinguish characteristics of L, *i.e.* Luke's source, and of Luke himself. But I think it unfortunate that he has been so far influenced by B. Weiss in assuming that almost all the peculiar Lucan matter is homogeneous. That

[1] If space permitted, it would be interesting to investigate the implications of the admittedly Marcan character of Peter's denials in Luke for the Lucan narrative of the Last Supper.

is exactly the point to be considered, and we need to inquire into the distribution of common characteristics in the peculiar Lucan matter. Very valuable from this point of view is the long additional note in vol. ii. of Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, which I think it is timely to recall at the present stage of Lucan criticism. Stanton begins by inquiring into the evangelist's own distinctive style and vocabulary by the one secure method which is open to us, namely, a comparison of the original Mark with Mark as it reappears in Luke. Finding here some criterion of Luke's method and distinctive vocabulary, he attacks the peculiar Lucan matter with a view to discovering the extent to which Luke may be reproducing another source. His conclusion is that the greater part of the peculiar Lucan matter is not pronouncedly Lucan in style and vocabulary and may be ascribed with some confidence to a written source. But he distinguishes nine sections where the language is so definitely Lucan that the suggestion is near to hand that Luke is freely composing himself. It is interesting from the point of view of the earlier part of this paper to notice that Stanton's list includes the two main Lucan additions to Mark's Passion narrative, namely, the trial before Herod and the Penitent Thief, as well as the Resurrection Appearances in ch. 24. It should be added that Stanton is one of those who think that Luke does use a second written source in parts of the Passion narrative. Conclusive results are perhaps hardly to be looked for, but I think it would be worth while for a student to work through and test Stanton's pages, and then attack the problem from the other end, looking first for passages where Lucan characteristics are least prominent and using them as a provisional criterion for the study of the rest.

Great interest attaches to this material, which plainly represents a distinct strand in the tradition. Much of it, at any rate, appears to be homogeneous. It is Jewish in colouring, anti-Pharisaic, probably Palestinian, probably the work of a Greek-speaking believer in a Greek-speaking Church. As Streeter has pointed out, Luke himself appears frequently to prefer this other source to Mark. Sometimes he drops Marcan narratives because he has a counterpart in this source, though sometimes the Marcan and the non-Marcan parallels are both allowed to stand. The freedom with which Luke treats Mark may be fairly interpreted to reflect a sense of Mark's inadequacy and even to foreshadow the neglect which overtook the second Canonical Gospel in the Early Church. But the development of the Gospel tradition is obscured if we fail to do justice to the positive contribution which Mark has made to the later Gospel literature. A chief function of the Marcan text has been to provide the framework which Matthew and Luke have utilized. The three great divisions of the Lucan Gospel—the Galilean ministry, the journey to Jerusalem, the last days—have been taken over from Mark. The disposition of the material from Q and from L—perhaps we should rather say from Q+L—finds its explanation in the evangelist's familiarity with the Marcan outline. It is a commonplace of criticism that although the central section of Luke is ostensibly an account of the journey of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem, a great deal of the actual material seems to presuppose a more settled ministry. The recurrent notices that Jesus is *en route* for Jerusalem are superimposed upon recalcitrant matter. The obvious explanation is that Luke starts with the Marcan framework. He is able to retain its essential structure by putting together the greater part of his non-Marcan material into the last journey which Mark records but does not describe.

I am encouraged to find how far Canon Streeter is prepared to go with me here. If 'framework' is understood to mean 'biographical outline' he is ready to agree that between the Sermon at Nazareth and the Last Supper the framework comes from Mark, and that 'some of the notices of movement which have caused some people to give to the central section of the Gospel the absurd name of "travel document" were introduced by the last editor to make his extracts from Proto-Luke run on better with narrative sections taken over from Mark.' For the centre of the Gospel there is not much difference between us. But I am impressed by Dr. Hunkin's acute argument for carrying back the Marcan framework to the story of the Baptist (*Journal of Theological Studies*, xxviii. 252), and I have already given my reasons for thinking that Mark is integral to the Lucan Passion narrative. If I am right, then, that Mark is not a secondary afterthought, but the backbone of the work which we read.

In the last few years Gospel study has been mainly occupied with attempts to recover the history of the tradition which lies behind all our sources. This work presupposes conclusions about sources which the scholarship of the last century attained. A mistake in source criticism may seriously mislead the criticism of 'forms.' This paper is written in the belief that the Gospel of St. Luke, as we read it now, is a work of self-

conscious art. The author has used sources, some of which we know, some of which we infer. On the whole he is conservative in his treatment of the Lord's sayings. In historical narration he allows himself at times a good deal of liberty, and the same is probably true of his treatment of some of the parables. Great caution is, therefore, necessary in using the evidence of the finished Lucan work to throw light upon earlier stages of the transmission of the Gospel history.

Literature.

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

In Spirit and in Truth (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), edited for the Society of Jews and Christians by Mr. George A. Yates, M.A., is claimed by the publishers to be the first Jewish-Christian Symposium ever published. It presents various aspects of Judaism and Christianity in papers and addresses given, for the most part, during the past eight years; and, as the Dean of Canterbury remarks in the Preface, its appearance, at a moment marked by bitter outbursts of anti-Semitism, is singularly opportune. And he goes on to testify that 'in face of gross superstitions and soulless secularism we need the Jewish constancy, the Jewish fierce unquenchable belief in God, the Jewish character, and the Jewish brains.'

The names of the contributors to this book include such well-known names in Christian circles as those of A. E. Garvie, O. C. Quick, B. H. Streeter, W. R. Matthews, C. C. J. Webb, Charles E. Raven, John Oman, and F. C. Burkitt. Among the Jewish contributors the best known in Christian circles is C. G. Montefiore. The contributions, for the most part in couplets, deal with such subjects as the Approach to God, the Reality of God, the Problem of Evil, the Atonement, Social Teaching, and the Devotional Life. Among the single contributions we were particularly attracted by N. E. Egerton Swann's on the Nature of Revelation. Perhaps the most forceful of all the essays is the concluding one, in which C. G. Montefiore writes on 'Jewish Views of Christianity,' in which it is affirmed that Jews are more generous to Christianity than Christians are to Judaism. For Christians always seem to hold that Judaism's work was done when it gave birth to Christianity, whereas the Jewish view is that Christianity's function is to be a sort of halfway house between heathenism and Judaism; 'from the worship of many gods the nations are to pass through Christian Trinitarianism to the pure Jewish doctrine of the stainless unity of God.' It amuses Dr. Montefiore, from his liberal standpoint, to find that each religion holds that the purpose of the other lies in close connexion with itself: 'The purpose of Judaism was to produce Christianity; the purpose of Christianity is to produce more Judaism. Thus do men argue: shall we, perhaps, rather say that how *God* meant and means it all is hidden from our eyes?'

ANCIENT EGYPT.

Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, the late Keeper of Assyrian and Egyptian Antiquities, is a recognized master of his subject, and has the gift of expressing it in popular form. He has given us another of his valuable productions, *From Fetish to God in Ancient Egypt* (Milford; 21s. net). The volume deals with the religion of pre-dynastic Egypt, together with the cults, legends, and theological systems of the succeeding ages. In Part I., containing chapter after chapter of fascinating material, he pictures the religious beliefs of the Egyptians from the early time when these people filled earth, air, sea, and sky with hostile evil spirits and lived in terror of the Evil Eye, trusting to magic for help and deliverance, to the day when the Egyptian nation hailed Amen-Ra of Thebes as their One God, lord of the thrones of the whole world. In Part II. he gives us revised English translations of some fine Egyptian hymns, as well as of many interesting myths, both ritual and ætiological; and this section is enriched with a chapter on the 'Dramatic Aspects of Certain Myths,' by Sidney Smith, his successor at the British Museum. Perhaps the most important chapters in the book are those dealing with the Chester Beatty Papyrus No. 1, of which a summary is given, and those concerning Sethe's study of the reign of Shabaka (about 700 B.C.). Sir Wallis shows that, according to the remarkable hieroglyphic text of this reign in the British Museum, the theological