

can by no possible temporal means be sustained by evidence,—to say that of which the proof appeals immediately only to the utterer and to the Searcher of hearts,—to say that of which the evidence can be made visible only in the presence

of the 'Great white throne, and of Him that sitteth thereupon,'—in a word, to say with Jesus (or rather, having Christ in us, to let Him renew the saying in us that crowns His life of redeeming love), 'Father, not My will, but Thine, be done.'

Prophecy and History.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

THE mutual relation between Prophecy and History is a large subject. It is not the purpose of this article to exhaust it, but to endeavour to throw some passing lights on this comprehensive theme.

1. Prophecy *had* a history. It began at a certain time, it lasted for a succession of centuries, and it closed its mouth when it had accomplished its task. It *might* have happened that Prophecy discharged itself of its message all at once, but as a matter of fact it unfolded itself during a lengthened period of time. God was not pleased to reveal His whole plan by the mouth of a single prophet, but raised up a somewhat extended succession of interpreters of His will. Let us glance at the stages which the development of Prophecy passed through.

The prophets, as time went on, had to make always more clear the purpose of God to set up a spiritual kingdom of His grace. Political events and prophetic oracles co-operated in establishing the principle that the true Kingdom of God must be dissociated from any particular land or people. It was in the time of Isaiah that this principle began to be impressed upon men's minds by the course of political events, and to be proclaimed at the same time in the addresses of the prophet (Is 30¹⁵). This twofold method of teaching was continued when the throne of the Davidic family was overthrown at the Exile, and not set up again after the Return of Jahweh's people. Could there have been any clearer evidence of the Divine purpose that Christ's kingdom was not to be of this world (Jn 18³⁶)?

The eyes of the prophets were during the same period more and more opened to perceive the superhuman origin of the future King of this

kingdom. No doubt the mention of the Davidic family as the point of descent of the future Saviour is somewhat obscured in the later prophecies (cf. Zec 6¹¹⁻¹³), and is wholly wanting in Malachi. Yet, in proportion as the glory of the Davidic descent of the Anointed One faded (Is 11¹⁵, Mic 5¹), all the more clear became His Divine nature (Is 7¹⁴ 9^{6f.}), and His identity with God was all the more emphasized (Zec 12¹⁰, Mal 3¹).

At the same time the true idea of the office and work of the Redeemer was more fully revealed. For instance, is not He who previously received the title of hero or king (*e.g.* Nu 24¹⁷, 2 S 7^{11ff.}) or prophet (Dt 18¹⁵), called in the later periods a priest (Ps 110⁴, Zec 6¹³)? Did not the prophets, as time went on, refer always more distinctly to the suffering of the future Deliverer? The clearest traces of this remarkable element in O.T. prophecy are to be found in the following passages:—In Is 11¹ and Mic 5¹ it is said that the ideal descendant of David's family is to participate in the misfortunes of this house. The shoot springs not from the top, but from the root, and is to be born not at Jerusalem, but at Bethlehem. Further, in Zec 9⁹ the future King is characterized as 'lowly,' and according to 12¹⁰ he is to be 'pierced.' Finally, in Is 53^{2ff.} we have a touching picture of the lamb which is brought to the slaughter and opens not its mouth.

The last feature in the sublime picture which the O.T. draws of God's peculiar Kingdom consists in the announcement that all constituents of the human race are to be numbered amongst its citizens. This promise was, it is true, included in the very first utterances of O.T. prophecy (*e.g.* Gn 3¹⁵ 12³), and was not forgotten in later process of time, but it was never expressed more

clearly than in Jahweh's words, 'from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name—is and—shall be great among the Gentiles' (Mal 1¹¹). Do we not hear already the voice of the Saviour who said, 'Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest' (Mt 11²⁸)?

It is not, then, merely the form of Prophecy that changed as the centuries ran their course, but this difference in its form is itself a matter of great interest, and it is not within recent times that it has been first perceived. As long ago as the Talmud we meet with a saying which contains a striking illustration of this difference of form which marks different prophecies. I refer to the familiar words, 'Everything Ezekiel saw, Isaiah, too, saw, but Ezekiel with the eyes of a rustic who has seen the king, Isaiah with the eyes of the citizen who has seen him' (*Chag'ga*, 13a). The meaning is, that the descriptions found in Ezekiel's book are elaborated in much greater detail, and sometimes developed at greater length, than is the case with Isaiah's book (cf. e.g. Ezk 1³⁻²³ with Is 6¹⁻⁸). Again, will anyone deny that the prophecies of Amos and of Haggai, for instance, differ in form from one another? Then let him note how the pronoun 'I' in the Book of Amos is represented ten times by *anokhi* (2^{of}, 13, 4⁷, 5¹, 6^{8ber}, 7¹⁴, 9⁹), and only once by *ani* (4⁶), whereas in the Book of Haggai *anokhi* does not occur at all, but there are four occurrences of *ani* (1¹³, 2⁴, 6, 21). But this single illustration is in itself a sufficient evidence of the fact that the form of the prophecies changed as time went on, and there is now all the less need to go into this matter in detail, as the fact has been already established by me in my *Einleitung* (p. 297 ff.), and the present article will immediately furnish a new opportunity for looking back at the historical transformations of form that passed upon prophecy.

2. While Prophecy had a history, it simply underwent a course of development parallel to the historical occurrences, but did not derive its origin from the latter.

To begin with an external feature, the change in the form of the prophecies proceeded in parallelism with the development in the linguistic usage which we may observe in the O.T. in general. I showed this on a previous occasion (*THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, ix. p. 475) in tracing

the history of the employment of *anokhi* and *ani*. But the same fact can be established by other indications apart from this. At present I would direct attention to some elements of the so-called *dialectus poetica*, a term which, so far as I know, was first employed with reference to the O.T. by Robert Lowth in his famous *Praelectiones de poesi Hebraeorum* (Oxon. 1753). In Praelec. iii. (ed. Rosenmüller, 1815, p. 31) we read: 'Hebraei cum glossis tum vocum anomaliis . . . in fine vocum identidem additis stylum distinxerunt et dialectum quandam poeticam sibi confecerunt.' It is well known that remnants of ancient case endings furnish one means towards a loftier diction, to which, since the time of Lowth, it has been customary to give the title, 'dialectus poetica.' One will recall הִיחֹ etc. Gn 1²⁴, Nu 23¹⁸ 24^{3, 15}, Is 56⁹, Zeph 2¹⁴, Ps 50¹⁰ 79² 104^{11, 20} 114⁸; נִנְבְּחִי etc. Gn 31³⁹ 49^{11f}, Ex 15⁶, Dt 33¹⁶, 2 S 22¹⁴, Is 1²¹ 22¹⁶, Jer 10¹⁷ etc., Ezk 27⁸, Hos 10¹¹, Ob 3, Mic 7¹⁴, Zec 11⁷, Ps 101⁵ 110⁴ 113^{5f}, 114⁸ 116¹ 123¹, La. 1¹ 4²¹; and אִימָתָה etc. Ex 15¹⁶ [Samar. אִימָה], Is 8²⁸, Ezk 28¹⁵, Hos 8⁷ 10¹⁸, Jon 2¹⁰, Ps 3⁸ 63⁸ 80³ 92¹⁶ 94¹⁷ 120¹ 124⁴ 125³, Job 5¹⁶ 10²² 34¹³ 37¹². Is a single one of these forms to be found in the prophecies of Haggai, Zec 1-8, or Malachi? In these sections of the O.T. one will search equally in vain for the following forms: *tāmō* = 'to them,' which in the prophetic literature occurs in Is 16⁴ 23¹ 26^{14, 16} 30⁵ 35⁸ 43⁸ 44^{7, 15} 48²¹ 53⁸ (see, on this last passage, my work, *The Exiles' Book of Consolation*, Edin.: T. & T. Clark, 1899, p. 32), Hab 2⁷; *bal* = 'not,' Hos 7² 9¹⁶ (Kerê), Is 14²¹ 26^{10f, 14, 18} 33^{20f, 23} 35⁹ 40²⁴ 43¹⁷ 44^{8f}; *minni* or *minnê* = 'of,' Is 30¹¹ 46³, Mic 7¹²; *bēmō*, Is 25¹⁰ (Kerê) 43² 44^{16, 19}; *kēmō*, Hos 7⁴ 13⁷ Is 26^{17f}, 30²² 41²⁵ 51⁶, Jer 13²¹ 50²⁶, Ezk 16⁵⁷, Hab 3¹⁴, Zec 9¹⁵ 10^{2, 7f}; *'ādē*, Is 26⁴ 65¹⁸; *'ālē*, Is 18⁴, Jer 8¹⁸, Mic 5⁶. All these linguistic phenomena are equally absent from the historical books of the post-exilic period, for the only two exceptions known to me, namely, *bal* in 1 Ch 16³⁰ and *kēmō* in Neh 9¹¹, occur in quotations from Ps 96¹⁰ and Ex 15⁶ (בְּמוֹ אֲבוֹ) respectively. Consequently it is proved that, as regards the employment of the so-called *dialectus poetica*, the prophetic and the historical books of the O.T. followed practically parallel lines.

Again, the contents of the prophetic oracles show a remarkable correspondence with the course

of historical occurrences. For instance, in the prophetic books of the O.T., as they follow one another according to the chronological data supplied by themselves, the following series of leading features of the political situation are seen reflected. In the days of Amos there was a circle of independent states round about Israel, as, for instance, the kingdom of Damascus (Am 1²). According to Am 7^{9ff.} the kingdom of Israel itself still possessed independence. The Books of Amos (5²⁷) and Hosea (9⁸ 10⁶ 12²) contain only more or less hidden allusions to Assyria as the power which is to execute Jahweh's sentence upon His rebellious people. But in the oracles of Isaiah (7^{20ff.} 10⁵ etc.) this function is assigned to Assyria in perfectly unambiguous language. There, too, it is implied that both Damascus and Samaria had fallen a prey to the Assyrians (10⁹, 'Is not Samaria as Damascus?'), and the kingdom of Judah is the only one which appears in 28^{5ff.} as still independent. In the Books of Nahum and Jeremiah we see the fall of the Assyrian empire, and the rise of Babylon as the sovereign power in Western Asia. The Babylonian Exile which Jeremiah could only predict is an actual experience of Ezekiel, while Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi mention the Persian governor who at Jerusalem had taken the place of the Davidic king.

Now the occurrence of these events is witnessed to also by non-biblical traditions, as well as their occurrence in the above order. For instance, the cuneiform texts relate how king Ahab, fighting as an ally of the king of Damascus, was defeated in the battle of Karkar, 854 B.C. (*K.I.B.* i. 173). They mention also indirectly the so-called Syro-Ephraimitish War (Is 7^{1ff.}), for we read in them how Tiglath-pileser, at Ahab's call for help, advanced into West Asia, subdued Damascus (731 B.C., according to Winckler, *Gesch. Isr.* i. 168), and invaded the kingdom of Israel (cf. Is 7^{15ff.}). Likewise the victory which Sennacherib gained over the Egyptians at Altau (701 B.C.) is recorded in the Assyrian annals (*K.I.B.* ii. 93), although they pass over in silence (Tiele, *Bab.-Assyr.-Gesch.* p. 315) the disaster that befell him at Pelusium (Is 37³⁶, Herod. ii. 141).

One might go on in this way exhibiting the parallelism between the contents of the prophetic oracles and the course of the history of the nations. But it is of more importance to bring

to light the inner ground of this parallelism and its bearing upon the origin of prophecy. The correct judgment on these two points appears to me to be the following:—

(a) The ideal source of this parallelism between Prophecy and History lay in the benevolent consideration of God for the contemporaries of the prophets in every age. Prophecies could be understood by the hearers of each particular prophet only if the persons and peoples and institutions introduced with a view to vividness of impression actually existed at the time when the prophecies were uttered. It would have been little in accordance with the methods of the wisest of all teachers to have presented to the contemporaries of a prophet phenomena which lay beyond their historical horizon.

(b) In spite of the parallelism between Prophecy and History, the latter was by no means the source of Prophecy. This is certain on more grounds than one.—*First*, the prophets over and over again insisted that they stood in a unique relation to God, that they alone were the mouth, *i.e.* the interpreters of the Deity (Ex 4¹⁶ 7¹, Is 30¹, Jer 15¹⁹). They could not have made this claim if they had done nothing more than was possible for any one, namely, observed the course of historical events and drawn conclusions from it.—*Secondly*, the prophets did not deny that there were wise men and men of understanding in Israel (Is 5²¹ 29¹⁴, Jer 18¹⁸⁻²⁰), but Isaiah had to announce that 'the wisdom of their wise men shall perish' (29¹⁴⁻¹⁶), for God 'also is wise' (31²), and 'as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are His ways higher than man's ways' (55⁹).—*Thirdly*, God's influence on the course of history was not identical with the manifestation of which the prophets were conscious, for, says Amos (3⁷), 'the LORD God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secrets unto His servants the prophets.'—*Fourthly*, we must not entirely forget that there are unquestionable instances of real prediction. One of the clearest of these is contained in the Book of Isaiah. This prophet predicted, a year before the event, not merely the siege of Jerusalem by the Assyrian armies, but the termination of this siege by a sudden and unexpected disaster dispersing the attacking forces (Is 29¹⁻⁸, 5). So different did the prospect appear to the people of the city that they could attach no meaning to the prophet's words, and stared at him, as he spoke, with

astonishment and incredulity (29^o). But Isaiah does not shrink from repeating his promise, and at last predicts that 'the Assyrian shall fall with the sword not of a mighty man' (31⁸), and so precisely it came to pass (37³⁶; cf. further, the admirable remarks of Canon Driver in his *Sermons on Subjects connected with the O.T.* p. 110).

3. We have thus reached three conclusions: Prophecy had a history; Prophecy developed in parallelism with the History; but it had not its source in the History. It may appear bold to add a fourth proposition, namely, that the authority of Prophecy is not dependent on its outward correspondence with the history. Nevertheless this proposition finds direct and indirect support in Scripture.

(a) It is positively declared in the O.T. that the threatenings and the promises of the prophets were spoken *conditionally*. For instance, Jeremiah had to proclaim in God's name, 'At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against which I have spoken, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them,' etc. (187-10). God has thus established it as the maxim of His providential government of the world that He makes the cancelling of His threatenings and the fulfilment of His promises dependent upon the conduct of the peoples in view. This maxim is illustrated by an actual case in Jer 26^{18f.}. The prophet Micah (3¹²) had announced that Jerusalem would be laid waste, but this threat was not carried out because of the repentance of Hezekiah and of the whole of Judah, and Jeremiah avails himself of this circumstance for the purpose of self-defence. The same principle is supported by 2 S 11¹⁻¹³, 1 K 11¹¹ 13^{21f.} 21^{19. 29}, 2 K 20^{1. 5}, Ezk 18²⁹ 33¹¹, Jon 3⁸⁻¹⁰. The fulness with which, according to Is 55^{11f.}, the word of God shall return to His mouth, may vary in form. A Divine threatening may, indeed, bring about as its result the outward evil that was threatened, but the result may be reached equally well by the conversion of the persons threatened. A Divine promise, on the other hand, may, indeed, be fulfilled precisely in the way announced by God's prophet, but it may also find its fulfilment in the case of other persons, in a more restricted measure, or in a different sense.

(b) It is undeniable that the course of Divine

revelation led to an ever greater spiritualizing of its contents.

This is noticeable first of all in the course of the Divine *legislation* of the Old and New Testaments. Let us fix our attention upon some instances. The first series of bodies of law is found in Gn 1²⁸⁻³⁰ 9¹⁻⁷ 17^{1ff.}, Ex 20²⁻¹⁷. This series shows at least that the scope of the Divine demands underwent extension. But if we follow the legislation of the O.T. a step farther, we read in Leviticus how strictly the requirement was enforced that Israel was not to defile itself by the eating of the flesh of certain animals (Lv 11). But what said Christ? 'Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man' (Mt 15¹¹). Further, in Deuteronomy it is expressly said, 'When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement' (Dt 24¹). But Christ lays down this rule for the citizens of His kingdom: 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery' (Mt 19⁹). Again, the exclusive holiness of the central sanctuary of Israel is very sharply emphasized in Dt 12^{5ff.}, whereas in Jn 4²¹ we read, 'Believe Me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain (Gerizim), nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.' Finally, there are not a few passages of the O.T. in which the presenting of animal offerings is put forward as a means of propitiating God (Lv 1¹⁷ etc.), but the Psalmist, for instance, sings 'the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit' (51¹⁷); and could the insufficiency of animal offerings be more clearly expressed than in the words 'neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place' (He 9¹²)? These may suffice as specimens of the indications in O.T. and N.T. from which we gather that the *legislative* basis of the Divine covenant advanced in the direction of spiritualizing.

This implies already the possibility that the *promises* of the covenant God also assumed, as time went on, always more of a spiritual character. But, more than that, it can be proved that this was actually the case. Let us consider, for instance, the relation of the special Kingdom of God to the land of Canaan. It is an extremely interesting feature in the story of the patriarchs

that the first and only permanent item of their possessions in Canaan was the sepulchral cave at Hebron (Gn 23¹⁷ 25⁹ 35²⁷ 49³⁰ 50¹³). What a striking hint of the real and final relation between the special Kingdom of God and the earth! The same idea is contained in the words of the covenant in Ex 19⁶ as well as in Gideon's refusal to reign as king over Israel (Jg 8²³). At a later period, no doubt, the long-suffering of God conceded the human kingship (1 S 8⁷⁻⁹), and this goodness of God supported David and other kings in the work of subduing Israel's enemies. But at the time when the great Eastern monarchies flourished, the relation of Israel to earthly empires is regulated differently: 'For thus saith the Lord, Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, By returning and rest shall ye be saved, in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength' (Is 30¹⁵). That is to say, as the context shows, if Israel declines alliances with other kingdoms (30¹⁷. Egypt), and gives up its eager desire for warlike equipments (30¹⁶ horses, etc.), its existence shall be conserved. In this announcement of Isaiah's the canon is implied that the special Kingdom of God is not to engage in rivalry with the kingdoms of men by heaping up earthly means of help and by pursuing earthly aims. What an advance beyond the time of David, and what an approach to Christ's words, 'My kingdom is not of this world' (Jn 18³⁶)!

Other evidences of the gradual spiritualizing of the promises of the covenant have been already touched on at the beginning of this article, and all these traces of the development of the O.T. legislation and promises show how rightly the institutions of the old covenant can be called a *σκιά τῶν μελλόντων* when the apostle says, 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ' (Col 2^{16f.}). And no less intelligible is the ground of St. Stephen's reproach of the Jews, spoken before the Sanhedrin, that they 'always resisted the Holy Ghost' (Ac 7⁵¹); nay, did not St. Stephen himself expressly point out what he meant? Surely, when he reminds the Jews how Moses foretold the advent of a perfect prophet (Ac 7³⁷ = Dt 18¹⁵), and how the words, 'Heaven is My throne, and earth is My footstool' (Is 66¹) pointed to a time when the

unique dignity of the temple at Jerusalem was to be abrogated (Ac 7⁴⁰).

Yes, the famous declaration of the apostle, 'The law was our schoolmaster . . . unto Christ' (Gal 3²⁴) is true in more senses than one. Besides other ideas, it includes this one, that God adopted the method of a *παιδαγωγός*, which consists in leading up from the lower to the higher degrees of knowledge. And might not God follow the example of a teacher who at first tells his pupils that the earth is a sphere till at last he can add that, if one wishes to speak with mathematical accuracy, it is really a spheroid? Truly the omniscience and the wisdom of God stand in no less noble a rivalry than His holiness and His grace! And was it not at the last period of the history of revelation that God sent the Perfect Teacher? The words are not to be forgotten, 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him' (Jn 1¹⁸). And how well this agrees with the words, 'He is the mediator of a better covenant' (He 8⁶).

In view of this general relation of O.T. promise to N.T. history, it is equally intelligible how promise and actuality do not show a mechanical correspondence in the matter of the picture of the Messiah. As a matter of fact, with all the gradual opening of the eyes of the prophets to recognize the superhuman origin and the spiritual character of the work of the Messiah, there remained still a gap which was filled up only by the N.T. history. This discrepancy between promise and realization is evidenced as a fact by the doubt of the contemporaries of Jesus as to whether He was the Messiah. Even His forerunner took offence at the methods of the activity of Jesus, as one may see from his question, 'Art thou He that should come?' and we know the remarkable scene when 'Jesus began to show unto His disciples, how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed,' etc., 'then Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from Thee, Lord, this shall not be unto Thee' (Mt 16^{21f.}). Such action on the part of Peter would be inexplicable if in the time of Christ the picture of suffering which is drawn in the Grand Passion of Is 53 had been generally referred to the Messiah. But after what has been said above

as to the course of O.T. prophecy, it is not strange, on the other hand, that in this famous chapter only an *indirect* figure, or a type, of the suffering Messiah is portrayed. How strongly this last assumption is supported by the text and context of Is 53 one will find pointed out in my book just published. There are not wanting, indeed, features which positively forbid us to find a *direct* preannouncement regarding our Saviour in this chapter. Let one think of the expressions, 'he shall see (his) seed' (v.¹⁰) and 'he shall divide the spoil with the strong' (v.¹²). No, just as 'the virgin' (Is 7¹⁴) did not stand before the prophet's eye in the concrete as the Virgin Mary, but always attained to greater distinctness, in parallelism with the growing clearness of vision regarding her son, such is the relation also in which the Servant of the LORD of Is 52¹³-53¹² stands to the Saviour of the New Testament. The true Israel, the Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ of Gal 6¹⁶,

found its complete realization in Jesus Christ. And we may well thank the Disposer of the history of salvation for this graduated process. Had it not been so, it might have been said that the Saviour derived His self-consciousness and His commission from Prophecy.

As I have said elsewhere (*The Exiles' Book of Consolation*, p. 205), 'Prophecy is like the rosy dawn which ushers in the day. The prophetic word is "a light which shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts" (2 P 1¹⁹). Prophecy is as trustworthy as the dawn certainly kisses the hem of the sun's robe. Moreover, were there no dawn, there would be no day, and the soft glow of the morning red prepares the eye for the brighter light, and cheers the heart that yearns for the day. But the rosy hue of morning is not the blazing day-star itself. Aurora pales when the monarch Sun assumes his radiant sway.'

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

It has become customary now to distinguish between the human and the divine in Holy Scripture. And the human element is understood to be matters of fact—geographical, historical, chronological fact; while the divine is the morality and the religion. The writers, we are then told, may err in matters of fact, but the Spirit of God cannot err in His religious and moral teaching.

The real difficulty in the way of this handy classification is that outsiders of all kinds find just as many mistakes in the religion and morality of the Old Testament as in its matters of fact. And here is Mr. Buchanan Gray, who is not an outsider, delivering lectures and publishing them on 'The Growth of Moral Ideas in the Old Testament.' He delivered three lectures on that subject to the Friends' Summer School of Theology at Birmingham in September 1899, and he has published them, along with a paper read before the Congregational Union. The title of the paper and of the book is *The Divine Discipline of Israel* (A. & C. Black, crown 8vo, pp. 132, 2s. 6d. net).

It is an interesting study, and it loses none of

its natural interest in Mr. Gray's hands. But if there is growth in the Old Testament morality, how is it authoritative and divine? At what point in its development shall we cut in for our authority? If at the end, at the full blossom in Christ, what is to be done with all that goes before? Perhaps we made a mistake in the separation into human and divine.

A handy history of the Reformation in Scotland would be a right welcome addition to our religious literature. It might even save Scotland from the religious reaction which some see ahead of us. The need has been so greatly felt that Mr. Guthrie actually prepared Knox's History for modern reading. The late Professor Mitchell of St. Andrews has almost given us what we want. His book, which is called *The Scottish Reformation* (Blackwood, crown 8vo, pp. xlv, 318, 6s.), was delivered as the Baird Lectures in 1899; and it is edited by Dr. Hay Fleming. It is a fine scholarly contribution to its subject, a most instructive and delightful book. But it is not just the book we