

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 3.—July, 1880.

I.

THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY ON EARTH.

HE would be a bold thinker who should undertake to foretell the fortunes and the state of an American Republic five or ten centuries hence :—who should attempt not only to describe the type or types of government which may then exist here, but also to delineate the personal characteristics of the men and women of that distant era, the social life of the period, the grade of development and of civilization which our humanity will then have attained on this broad and elect continent. How much bolder would he be who, in full view of the present medley of antagonistic elements, religious, political, social, in European society and life, should propose to tell us what Europe will have become, after the agitations and the mutations of the next thousand years ! Bolder still would he be deemed who should attempt to prognosticate the future at that distant period, not of any single nation or continent, but of all the continents and all the races of mankind : who should assume to say what this world, in its controlling elements and tendencies, its prevailing spirit and principles and life, will be at the end of five or ten more centuries of activity and of growth. But would not he be boldest of all—daring beyond all comparison—who should venture to prophesy concerning the career and development of our humanity, not for any such given period however prolonged, but down to the last century and the last hour of recorded time : unfolding before our vision that ultimate issue in which the whole of human life on earth shall be consummated, in the decisive day

ber fifteen is made up of ten (= the ten tribes) + 2 (= Judah and Israel) + 3 (= Israel as kingdom, church, and nationality, as severally represented in the three pairs of deprivations, iii. 4).

Three little-known rabbinical commentaries have been carefully compared throughout, and one of them upon Hos. i.-ii. 3 is printed in full in Hebrew and Latin, occupying the last forty pages. It might thus serve as a convenient manual for any who are disposed to familiarize themselves with Rabbinical Hebrew.

W. H. G.

COMMENTAR ÜBER DIE EVANGELIEN DES MARKUS UND LUCAS. VON CARL FRIEDR KEIL, Dr. und Prof. der Theol. pp. 501. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke. 1879. (B. Westermann & Co., New York).

Dr. Keil, so well and so favorably known by his commentaries on the historical and prophetic books of the O. T., in now turning his attention to the histories of the N. T., brings with him a reputation which predisposes us all to look with interest and confidence upon his work. No one will need to be told that good, honest, careful work lies at the base of this new volume; Dr. Keil's name is an earnest of unobtrusive learning and a sound conservatism grounded in sober common sense. It will be sufficient, therefore, for a general characterization of the book to say that the author deals with the New Testament in the same spirit, and with the same amount of success with which he dealt with the Old. We find nothing particularly new in this Commentary,—nothing very startling; we cannot even say it will add much to "the scientific knowledge" of the books it treats,—it certainly is not epoch-making. But it is a sober, honest attempt to elucidate reverently the two histories with which it deals,—carried on not without learning, and with no sparing of care or fear of consequences. As such, it deserves high praise.

In general, the following is the view which the author takes of the books he is treating: Mark was the second gospel written (Matthew being the first), having been published before A.D. 70, probably at Rome. Its author was the John Mark of the Acts and Epp.—who is identified with the young man of Mk. xiv. 51. It was meant for Gentile readers and, as i. 1 shows, pretends only to set forth the beginning or origin of the Gospel, *i. e.*, to show how the Gospel now in the world had its origin in the person of Christ,—in the wonderful power He showed in teaching, healing, performing miracles, dying and rising again. The *contents*, *plan*, and *character* of the gospel are treated at length and most excellently. As to its origin, Papias certainly speaks of it and not of any Ur-Markus. Thus all Ur-Markus hypotheses are at once set aside. It is held that Mark is certainly dependent on our Matt., but not as its chief source,—which is the Apostolic tradition, gathered not only from Peter, but also from others of Christ's original followers, with whom Mark came in contact (Acts xii. 12, xiii. 5). Not only the authenticity, but the integrity of the book is very strongly defended; thus xvi. 9 *sq.* is held genuine.

Luke was written third of the gospels; and itself (i. 1-4) witnesses to its dependence on both written and unwritten pre-existent material, and that in such terms that Mark may be readily included in it, and Matt. is not necessarily excluded. Internal considerations prove Mark to have been used, but not necessarily as chief source. The use of Matt. remains in doubt. Luke was written before A.D. 70, and probably at Rome; and certainly by Paul's companion, writing for Gentile readers, and wishing to give not a chronicle, but a statement of the Evangelical history such as grouped the facts of salvation, with the end of proving the truth of the Christian teaching (cf. i. 3). The contents of the gospel are chosen and ordered with this end in view, the main part of the book falling into three divisions: 1. The teaching and miracles by which Jesus bore witness to Himself in Galilee, iv.-ix. 50; 2. A collection of Christ's teaching concerning His kingdom, ix. 51-xviii. 30; and 3. The completion of the Messianic witness through death, resurrection, and ascension, xviii. 31-

xxiv. 53. Thus the second division is not chronological in any sense ; but yet not arbitrarily introduced. Jesus had spoken largely on this subject after the occurrences at Caesarea Philippi ; what more fitting place to introduce a general view of Christ's teaching as to His kingdom ? The *plan* of the gospel (taken largely from Nösgen) is most excellently drawn out ; and its *character* almost equally so, especially its Greek character and dependence on Greek models. Its authenticity, integrity, and credibility are uncompromisingly defended.

It is impossible to enter here on the details of exposition. Take Luke i.-iii. as an example. In i. 39 Judah is understood as the country—the name of the town not being given. In Luke ii. 1-5 we find a long (15 pages) and fine refutation of Schürer's strictures on the historical character of the narrative. Keil, in ii. 2, throws the stress on the *ἐγένετο* and supposes that an enrollment begun in A. V. C. 749 was not completed until the autumn of 750. In Luke ii. 13, *εὐδοκία* is read on internal grounds ; the external evidence being considered equally balanced ! In Luke iii. 2, the reckoning is made from the beginning of Tiberius's sole reign, and the resulting inconsistency with Matt. ii. 1, escaped by two claims : the *ὥστε ἐτὼν τριάκοντα* is not definite, and it is by no means certain that Herod died so early as 750. In Luke iii. 23, the genealogy is held to be Mary's ; but the reference of each *τοῦ* following, back to Jesus, as so convincingly argued by Weiss, is wrongly rejected. These points will serve as samples.

B. B. W.

THE BIBLE COMMENTARY. New Testament, Vol. II. Gospel of John, by Canon WESTCOTT, and Acts of the Apostles, by Bishop JACOBSON. Royal 8vo. pp. xcvi. 534. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880. Price, \$5.

This new instalment of the Speaker's Commentary is the most valuable yet issued, touching as it does precisely those portions of Scripture whose integrity has been most violently assailed and which yet are vital to the Christian system.

It is matter of congratulation that the introduction to the fourth Gospel has fallen into the hands of Canon Westcott, whose extensive and accurate learning, clear thinking, habits of cautious investigation, judicial fairness, and general culture, fit him to handle it as its importance requires. (If any one desires to find a complete contrast to all these qualities in a current English writer upon this Gospel, let him take up Matthew Arnold's "God and the Bible.") The author's study of the Gospel has been so detailed and comprehensive that nothing seems to have escaped him. Treating, first, of the authorship, he marshals the internal evidences, indirect and direct, and then sketches the external. The latter is of course only an outline, the limits not admitting the necessary fulness of treatment. Next, the composition of the Gospel is taken up, embracing the author, the occasion and date, the object, the plan, the style, etc. Here the handling is masterly, and there is a substantial addition to the literature of the subject even after all that has been done by the accomplished scholars of the last and the present generation. The author seems to have worked the matter out for himself, and his views have a coherence, vigor, and freshness which are very attractive. And he very often, in this direct delineation of what lies before him, anticipates and answers the objections which are most commonly raised.

Every thoughtful reader of the New Testament knows that the differences between the fourth Gospel and the other three are great and startling, and that these, when elaborated and emphasized by a skilful writer, are made to have a very perplexing influence upon inexperienced minds. Now Dr. Westcott, without any *finesse*, so marshals the indubitable facts in the case, so sets forth John's character, surroundings, and relations ; so analyzes the content of the Gospel ; so shows its bearing upon what went before, as to satisfy the unprejudiced that there are good and valid reasons for all that is peculiar in this portion of the evangelic history. His answer to the objection drawn from the numerous long discourses of our Lord reproduced