Editorial

This year's Autumn edition of the Bulletin includes articles relating to – in order of appearance – historical theology, church history, practical theology and a second historical theology paper.

Professor Stewart's paper raises an interesting study relating to 19th century teaching on the second coming of Christ. The subject presents an example of how even a prevalent teaching can be recast and yet in its time received and believed. Later, upon inspection it is shown to be a folly. While reading Stewart's paper it is worth reflecting on our own practices in evangelical circles. Do we make every effort to be accurate in our accounts of what others say and teach? And are we ready to be corrected when incorrect? The paper shows the importance of accurately describing the views of others, even if – especially if – we do not agree with them. Otherwise the outcome shall prove the same.

Douglas Somerset's paper on the Reformation in Glasgow will be of interest to many readers, one for the connection many will have to Scotland's most populous city, but also for the lack of widespread knowledge about the reformation in Glasgow. The story of reformation in Scotland generally has for its focal points, places and people closer to the east or west coasts. This is understandable given the prominence of events that occurred elsewhere, but Somerset's paper gives us insight into the religious life of the city, controversies and developments at the time.

Ron Michener's paper on prayer provides a thoughtful discussion on a popular motif associated with prayer – that of a weapon. He queries a use of language that has become common currency in Christian circles. The question Michener takes up, which is surely the question to take up is, 'is it biblical'? In doing so he not only addresses the subject, he also expands upon what prayer is. More widely applied, the paper raises to our attention the importance of discerning the roots of Christian expression.

Finally, we have a paper from Mark J. Larson on Charles Hodge's acquaintance with Friedrich Schleiermacher. This discussion is one of importance for the church today. If we could produce a heat map of influential theologians today Schleiermacher would be among the most prominent for his belief that intuition and feeling is revelation; a by-product of which must be the cooling of a person's relationship to God's word. Despite this, as Larson discusses, Hodge had a favourable view of Schleiermacher's personal salvation. It reminds me of M'Cheyne's comments following Edward Irving's death, 'He is now with his God and Saviour,

whom he wronged so much, yet, I am persuaded, loved so sincerely.'[1] M'Cheyne could speak warmly of Irving's faith in Christ despite his errant theological views. Above that, 1 Corinthians 3:11-15 raises the importance of addressing matters such as those Larson discusses of intuition, feeling and revelation. These are matters of highest significance for they concern the eternal welfare of the present-day church.

[1] Quoted by N. R. Needham, 'Irving, Edward,' in *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology*, ed. by Nigel M. de S. Cameron (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), p. 437.

CONTRIBUTORS IN THIS NUMBER

Professor Kenneth Stewart is Emeritus Professor of Theological Studies at Covenant College, Lookout Mountain, Georgia, USA.

Dr Douglas Somerset is minister of the Free Presbyterian Church in Aberdeen and editor of the Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal.

Professor Ronald Michener is Professor and Department Chair of Systematic Theology at Evangelische Theologische Faculteit (ETF), Leuven, Belgium.

Dr Mark J. Larson is Professor of Systematic Theology at Heidelberg Theological Seminary, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, USA.

Professor Stewart's paper was originally delivered at the ETS annual meeting (United States), held online on 16th November 2020.

The Visible, Glorious Return of Christ: A Late Georgian Novelty?

Kenneth J. Stewart

I. A CONFESSION WITH WHICH TO BEGIN

Raised in a premillennial evangelical setting in which the visible and imminent return of Christ was a constant theme, I easily supposed that this conviction was a distinguishing mark of earnest Christianity everywhere and in all ages. In my adult life I have reassessed this approach to last things; yet, even so, I have not abandoned the opinion that premillennialist Christianity excelled at keeping the return of the Lord before the attention of the church to a degree that other approaches did not. Yet this observation leaves to one side the question of the methods premillennialists have relied on to foster this attentiveness.

II. A REPEATED CHARGE OF DOCTRINAL NOVELTY

With this in my background, you will understand why I took note of repeated modern claims (I will mention four) that this emphasis upon the visible, personal return of Christ represents a *novel* development introduced since 1820. In a 1988 essay, evangelical historian David W. Bebbington asserted, 'previously (to the 1820s), belief in a visible return by Christ in the flesh had been no part of accepted doctrine.'[1] This 1988 article was a warm-up for a treatment of the same issue in the same author's magisterial 1989 book, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. In it, Bebbington returned to this subject and argued in identical terms, adding, 'most respected Evangelicals did not believe it'.[2] This claim was further reiterated (though in a somewhat more muted manner) in the same author's 2005 *The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody*. There, Bebbington maintained, 'The novel teaching […] had the great attraction that, unlike much previous belief,

---

1 David W. Bebbington, 'The Advent Hope in British Evangelicalism Since 1800', *Scottish Journal of Religious Studies*, 9.2 (1988), 103. In drawing attention to this published opinion of Bebbington, the author stresses that this historian's grasp of the sweep of evangelical history is unrivalled and worthy of the highest esteem. He has been kind enough to comment on this paper.

2 David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: The Story from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), p. 83.

it held that the return of Christ would be in person'.[3] More recently, and with still more gusto, the Canadian historian, Donald Akenson, has reiterated this claim:

> this idea that the return of Jesus Christ as mentioned in the scriptures was to be taken as a literal prophecy of his actual physical return to earth in his original bodily form was so fresh, so minority-minted, that it was revolutionary. The idea simply was not part of Christian doctrine, generally conceived.[4]

The implication of this kind of historical argument was two-fold: first. Christianity (and evangelical Protestantism) had managed very adequately prior to 1820 without an emphasis on the visible return of Christ and second, that the introduction of this emphasis represented a narrowing and hardening of something which had earlier been more elastic.

III. WHAT KIND OF PROOF WAS BROUGHT FORWARD FOR THIS CHARGE OF 'NOVELTY'?

Less than you would have expected. Akenson, the last-named, cited no proof whatsoever in support of his contention.[5] Bebbington had focused upon the radical (and quite self-serving) complaints of the advocates of the new premillennialism emerging in the 1820s. The advocates were such figures as Henry Drummond (1786-1860), Edward Irving (1792-1834), and Lewis Way (1772-1840).[6] These rather angular characters were hardly dispassionate observers of the contemporary evangelical scene.[7] Bebbington buttressed their allegations with some instances suggesting ambivalent attitudes towards any physical second advent by evangelical luminar-

---

3 David W. Bebbington, *The Dominance of Evangelicalism: The Age of Spurgeon and Moody, History of Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: IVP, 2005), p. 91.

4 Donald Harman Akenson, *Exporting the Rapture: John Nelson Darby and the Victorian Conquest of North American Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 35.

5 As the resemblance between Akenson's claim and the earlier claim of Bebbington is striking, it would be fair to assume that the more recent writer was at least familiar with the claim of the earlier.

6 See the entries for each in the Donald M. Lewis, *Dictionary of Evangelical Biography*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996): Drummond, I, 326-7; Irving, I, 595-6; Way, II, 1164.

7 The disruptive influence of this trio has been described by the current author in 'A Millennial Maelstrom in Late Georgian London: The Tumultuous Course of the Continental Society 1818-1832', in *Prisoners of Hope: Evangelical Millennialism in the 19th Century*, ed. by Timothy Stunt and Crawford Gribben (Carlisle, Paternoster Publishers, 2004), chap. 6.

ies such as Thomas Scott (1747-1821), known as a Bible commentator and author and Charles Simeon (1759-1836), the notable Cambridge preacher.[8] Yet it is the argument of this paper that both Drummond, Irving and Way who originally made this charge, and Bebbington and Akenson who have relayed it, have misjudged matters. The first-named were mistaken in calling into question the belief of their evangelical contemporaries in a physical second advent. The second-named have not adequately supported their claim that these targeted attitudes were in fact held. Three strands of material accessible both to them (and to us) point in a different direction than the one they have argued for. We will address these three methodically in turn.

IV. CONSIDERING CREEDS, HYMNS, AND THE INTERPRETATION OF NEW TESTAMENT 'PILLAR' PASSAGES

A. Clues from Earlier Christianity: Creeds

The three premillennial critics, Irving, Drummond, and Way — whatever were their ideas on the last things — were not members of some obscure sect. Irving, a transplanted Scot, was serving a Church of Scotland congregation at London's Regent Square. Lewis Way was a Church of England minister, trained first in law, was labouring as the agent of a society aimed at the evangelization of Jews. Henry Drummond, a banker and a Member of Parliament, was active in the Church of England; he exercised the right to appoint the Church of England minister serving the parish church on his estates at Albury, Surrey. All three will have been familiar with the phraseology of the two ancient creeds (the Apostles and the Nicene), each of which incorporate language regarding Christ's second advent. The first speaks of Christ, seated at the right hand of God, 'from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead'; the second, more fulsomely states: 'He will come again with glory to judge the living and the dead, of whose kingdom there will be no end.'[9] If the three critics knew the cadences of

[8] Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, p. 81 note 56 cites J.H. Pratt, *The Thought of the Evangelical Leaders: Notes of Discussions of the Eclectic Society, London during the Years 1798-1814* (1856; reprinted Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1978), p. 256 in support of the claim regarding Scott; he cites William Carus, *Memoirs of the Life of Charles Simeon* (London: Hatchard & Sons, 1856), p. 658 in support of the claim regarding Simeon.

[9] The wording of each is quoted as printed in *Documents of the Christian Church*, ed. by Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder, 4th edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 25, 28.

these creeds, so — equally — did the contemporary evangelical Protestants who, they alleged, denied the physical return.[10]

B. Hymnody in the Eighteenth Century

It would be hard to make out a case for pervasive forgetfulness of Christ's return as well because Christian hymnody in the century before 1820 suggests a very different outlook. Who has not sung, 'Lo He comes with clouds descending, once for favoured sinners slain'? These are the lyrics of John Cennick (1718-1755), a Methodist hymn writer who latterly preached for the Moravians.[11] Or Charles Wesley's lyrics in 'Rejoice the Lord is King', a stanza of which is: 'Rejoice in Glorious Hope, Our Lord the Judge Shall Come'. Or John Newton's (1725-1807) lyrics, 'Day of judgment, day of wonders, hark the trumpet's awful sound', a second stanza of which says, 'See the judge, our nature wearing, clothed in awful majesty'. Earnest Christians in the century before 1820 were certainly singing about Christ's visible physical return. Their critics denied them credit for doing so.

C. Responsible Biblical Interpretation of Key N.T. Passages

And why would not have evangelical Christians been singing these lyrics which focused upon the visible, bodily return of the Lord, from heaven? Responsible biblical interpreters of the eighteenth century had, with fair consistency, interpreted key New Testament texts as pointing to nothing less than this. For simplicity of argument, we will here identify several 'pillar passages' of the New Testament all bearing on the question of Christ's future visible return. I am selecting:

- Matthew 24:30 in which Jesus said, 'all the people of the earth will mourn when they see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with great power and glory'

- Acts 1:11 in which two men dressed in white instruct the disciples, 'this same Jesus who has been taken from you into heaven, shall come back in the same way'

---

[10] In this connection, we may also allude to the fact that Gothic cathedral main entry arches (the 'tympanum') as well as religious art, such as Michelangelo's 'Last Judgment' within the Sistine Chapel, drew attention to the visible, physical return of Christ to the world confessed in these ancient creeds.

[11] Hymnologists such as John Julian, *A Dictionary of Hymnology* (New York: Scribners, 1892), p. 681, indicate that this hymn had some verses supplied by Charles Wesley.

- 1 Thessalonians 4:16 in which Paul instructs the Thessalonians 'the Lord himself will come down from heaven with a loud command, with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet call of God'

- Hebrews 9:27, 28 in which the writer explains 'He will appear a second time, not to bear sin, but to bring salvation to those who are waiting for him'[12]

If Irving, Drummond, and Way were correct in their assertions that there was currently no clear belief in the visible return of the Lord, we should expect to find representative biblical interpreters hedging in their treatment of N.T. statements such as these. But this is not what we find.

Matthew 24:30 'Coming on the Clouds of Heaven'

Commenting on Matthew 24:30 in his *Paraphrase and Commentary on the N.T.* first published in 1703, Daniel Whitby (1638-1726) — classified by most as a latitudinarian Anglican divine — was inclined to conclude that this was a metaphorical description of the events surrounding the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. In this he followed Josephus' *Jewish War*.[13] That Whitby accepted a physical return of Christ will be shown as we proceed to examine other passages. In contrast to Whitby, Matthew Henry (1662-1714), a Presbyterian who was almost certainly familiar with Whitby's commentary, writing around 1710, was certain that this Olivet discourse contained a clear reference to the return of Christ:

> The glorious appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ who will then show himself *the brightness of his Father's glory and the express image of his person* (emphasis his) will darken the sun and moon as a candle is darkened in the beams of the noon-day sun.[14]

Composing his *Family Expositor*, which was released in six volumes beginning in 1739, the Congregationalist, Philip Doddridge (1702-1751), evidently had read Whitby and Josephus; like Whitby, Doddridge was inclined to the view that Matthew 24:30 referred to first century occur-

---

12 All quotations are given from the NIV (2011).

13 Daniel Whitby, *Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament* (1703) incorporated into John Rogers Pitman and others, *A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament and the Apocrypha* (London: Priestly, 1822), p. 196.

14 Matthew Henry, *A Commentary on the Whole Bible*, 6 vols (Tappan, N.J.: Revell, n.d.), V, 358.

rences.[15] Thomas Scott (1747-1821) the Anglican minister and commentator — cited by Bebbington as an example of one who expected no physical second advent, was measured in the interpretation given in his *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, a 1781 work initially issued in 174 weekly instalments, before being bound together.[16] He allowed:

> The language of these verses is suited, and was probably intended to lead the mind of the reader to the consideration of the end of the world and the coming of Christ to judgment; yet the expressions […] must restrict the primary sense of them to the destruction of Jerusalem.[17]

Here is a somewhat muted affirmation of the physical return of Christ; while it is allowed, it is not found to be taught unambiguously in this Scripture. But Scott would be outdone by his Church of England contemporary, Charles Simeon of Cambridge. In his exposition of the Synoptic parallel to Matthew 24 in Mark 13, Simeon found a reference to Christ's physical second coming:

> Two things are indispensable for all who would behold his face in peace, namely, 'repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.' These must be experienced by you: neither the one nor the other can be dispensed with. Get a deep repentance therefore, and a lively faith: and rest not in any state short of that which the Scriptures require, and the primitive Christians actually attained.[18]

The picture becomes even more distinct when we consider a second major Scripture.

Acts 1:11 'This Same Jesus'

Commenting on Acts 1:11, in his *Paraphrase and Commentary on the N.T.* in 1703, Daniel Whitby (1638-1726) wrote:

> We are told in 2 Thessalonians 1.7, 8 that he is to come down from heaven with his holy angels in a flame of fire and in 1 Thessalonians 4.16, 17 that he

---

15 Philip Doddridge, *The Family Expositor*, 6 vols (Charlestown, MA: Etheridge, 1807), II, 49.

16 s.v. "Scott, Thomas", in *Dictionary of Evangelical Biography*, ed. by Donald M. Lewis, II, 989-91.

17 Thomas Scott, *A Commentary on the Whole Bible* (New York: Dodge & Sayre, 1816). The edition lacks pagination.

18 Charles Simeon, *Horae Homilecticae*, <https://www.studylight.org/commentaries/shh/mark-13.html> [accessed 17 September 2020].

> is to come down from heaven and snatch us to the clouds […] He will come in a cloud of glory, in his body.[19]

Matthew Henry who (unlike Whitby) had found Matthew 24:30 an unambiguous reference to the second advent wrote:

> This same Jesus shall come again in his own person, clothed with a glorious body; this same Jesus who came once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself will appear a second time without sin (Heb. 9.26, 28); he who came once in disgrace to be judged, will come again in glory to judge.[20]

The Congregationalist, Doddridge took up the same passage in his *Family Expositor* and paraphrased the words of the two angelic visitors, 'this same Jesus' as:

> There will be a time when He shall visit your earth once more and so come in a visible form, riding on a cloud as on a triumphant chariot, accompanied by angelic guards, in the same manner you have beheld him go into heaven.[21]

With such sentiments, commentator Thomas Scott was in agreement. On the same utterance of the angelic messengers, he commented:

> For though he was now ascended to his glorious throne in heaven, to return no more to reside on earth in his former condition, yet he would assuredly come at length in a visible manner, in the clouds of heaven, to judge the world, and to gather to himself all his believing people.[22]

Charles Simeon concurred in an exposition of Acts 1:9-11. He found there a straightforward indication of the future visible return of Christ:

> Of this our blessed Lord himself has spoken fully. "The Son of man shall be seen coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." "He shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him: then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats [Note: Matthew 24:30; Matthew 25:31-32.]." This is the advent spoken

---

19 Daniel Whitby, *Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament*, p. 506.

20 Henry, *Commentary*, VI, 8. The exposition of Acts was Henry's own. Comment on the remainder of the N.T. i.e. Romans through Revelation, was supplied, after Henry's decease, by ministers associated with Henry.

21 Doddridge, *Family Expositor*, III, 5.

22 Scott, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, on Acts 1:11 (unpaginated).

> of also by St. Paul, who says, "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God."[23]

It is apparent that though there was not consensus among the interpreters that the Olivet Discourse contained an unambiguous reference to the second advent as a physical event, this consensus existed unambiguously regarding this second Scripture.

1 Thessalonians 4:16: 'The Lord Himself Will Descend'

On this statement of Scripture, which by its very emphatic form, 'the Lord Himself' (*autos hó kurios*) draws attention to the identity of the one who will return from heaven, Daniel Whitby is more reticent than you might expect. He does draw attention to the phrase, 'the trumpet call of God' as indicating the approach of divine judgment; but leaves the doctrinal implications of Paul's statement about the descent of the Lord from heaven very underdeveloped.

Not so, Matthew Henry.[24] Unlike Whitby, who seemed almost blind to the doctrinal import of this statement of Paul, the Henry commentary faces this squarely:

> He ascended into heaven after his resurrection and passed through these material heavens into the third heaven which must retain him until the restitution of all things; and then he will come again and appear in glory. He will descend from heaven into this our air. The appearance will be with pomp and power.[25]

Similarly, Doddridge seizes on the import of the passage and exults in its implications:

> The Lord himself, our great and blessed redeemer, arrayed in all his own glory and that of his Father, shall in that great day descend from heaven with a triumphant shout raised by millions of happy attendant spirits. His appearance shall be proclaimed by the voice of an archangel.[26]

These sentiments are also those of Thomas Scott, who paraphrased Paul's statement thus:

---

[23] Simeon, *Horae Homilecticae*, on Acts 1:9-11, <https://www.studylight.org/commentaries/shh/acts-1.html> [accessed 17 September 2020].

[24] The introduction which is provided in full editions of the Matthew Henry *Commentary* indicate that this portion of the exposition was brought to completion after Henry's demise by Daniel Mayo.

[25] Henry, *Commentary*, VI, 785.

[26] Doddridge, *Family Expositor*, V, 316.

> At that solemn period, the Lord Jesus will be seen to descend from heaven with the acclamations of attendant angels who will be appointed to lead the hierarchies of heaven on this illustrious occasion, and with the trumpet of God.[27]

However, having said this much, it needs to be acknowledged that Charles Simeon's recorded comment and paraphrase on this Scripture lays its emphasis upon the certainty of the believer's future resurrection, rather than the divine visitation by which it will be secured. Having noted this, we can still acknowledge Simeon's comment which addresses the substance:

> When Jesus came in his state of humiliation, thousands withstood his voice: but none will, when he shall come in his own glory, and the glory of his Father, with his holy angels. The great and mighty, as well as the mean and insignificant, shall come forth alike, each re-united to his kindred body, and each appearing in his own proper character.[28]

Hebrews 9:27, 28: 'He will appear a second time, not to bear sin'

It is somewhat un-nerving to find that Daniel Whitby, a respected commentator, found nothing worth commenting on here as regards last things.[29] It is after all, the chief basis for Christians speaking of a 'second coming' of Jesus Christ.

The continuator of Matthew Henry[30] clearly saw more of significance in these assertions in *Hebrews* than did Whitby:

> Observe, it is the distinguishing character of true believers that they are looking for Christ: they look for him by faith; they look for him by hope and holy desires; they look for him in every duty, in every ordinance, in every providence now; and they expect his second coming and are preparing for it; and though it will be sudden destruction to the rest of the world, who scoff at the report of it, it will be eternal salvation to those who look for it.[31]

Philip Doddridge similarly saw matter of urgent importance in the text. He urged his readers:

---

27 Scott, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, II, n.p.

28 Charles Simeon, *Horae Homileticae*, <https://www.studylight.org/commentaries/shh/1-thessalonians.html> [accessed 17 September 2020].

29 Whitby, *Paraphrase and Commentary* in Pitman, *A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase*, p. 375.

30 Henry's contemporary, William Tong wrote this section of the *Commentary*.

31 Henry, *Commentary*, VI, 930.

> Let it (i.e. the prospect of His return) engage us to make immediate application to Christ as the great Saviour, with entire submission to his princely authority; for if that be disregarded, how shall we meet him as Judge? For when he appears the second time for the salvation of his people, he will exercise righteous judgement on his enemies and that vengeance can never appear so terrible as when considered as coming from the mouth of him who was once manifested to take away every sin by the sacrifice of himself.[32]

So also Thomas Scott, who urged:

> He will at last appear in another form, in all of his personal and mediatorial glory as the omnipotent, omniscient and righteous judge of the world in order to complete the salvation of all who believe in Him, wait for His coming, and prepare to meet Him.[33]

Finally, Charles Simeon devoted an entire exposition to the passage, verses 26-28, which he saw to be full of significance:

> As the high-priest, while offering the annual sacrifices, was clothed only in plain linen garments, but when he had completed his sacrifice, came forth in his splendid robes to bless the people [Note: Leviticus 16:23-24. with 8:7, 9 and Numbers 6:23-24.]; so our great High-priest will put off the garb of humiliation, and shine forth in all his majesty and glory [Note: Matthew 25:31.]

Thus, having surveyed five Bible commentators across the eighteenth century leading up to the denunciations of Drummond, Irving and Way, we have not found any general discounting of belief in a visible and physical return of Christ to the world. Even the latitudinarian Anglican, Whitby, allowed that this is what *some* major N.T. passages point towards (though he was less industrious than others we have named in finding N.T. references to it).

With this much said, there remains a problem: it is that the early nineteenth century premillennialists Drummond, Irving and Way *perceived* there to be a deficiency of conviction about Christ's return. When there is such ample evidence pointing in another direction, we are entitled to ask what has clouded the picture so much. There were at least two things clouding the picture, and each had to do with the contemporary understanding of future divine judgment. Let us consider how the second advent had been treated by eighteenth century theologians of two types.

---

[32] Doddridge, *Family Expositor*, VI, 69, 70.

[33] Scott, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, II, n.p.

V. CHRIST'S RETURN TO JUDGE IN POST-REFORMATION PROTESTANT THEOLOGY AND IN THE AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT

A. In Post-Reformation Protestant Theology

Consistent with the ancient creeds (which properly anticipate a return of Christ in triumph, from God's right hand)[34] as well as the Reformation confessions and catechisms,[35] eighteenth century evangelical believers were taught to expect a glorious return of Christ at world's end. When it did occur, this development would represent the final stage in the glorification or rehabilitation, before a watching world, of the divine saviour who had been so sadly rejected at his first coming. A Scripture commonly introduced into discussions about this future event was the saying of Paul before the Areopagus at Athens: 'God has set a day when he will judge the world with justice by the man he has appointed. He has given proof of this to everyone by raising him from the dead.'[36] That there would be a future divine judgment, that it had been entrusted to Jesus Christ the God-man, and that it would take place on this earth seems to have been the common conviction of Christians in the preceding century, as in the centuries before. One can find this conviction elaborated by a wide variety of doctrinal writers in this period.

So, for example:

The Calvinistic Church of England Cambridge theologian, John Edwards (1637-1717) addressed the theme in his *Theologia Reformata* (1713). Treating major Christian doctrines as reflected in the Apostles' Creed, Ten Commandments and Lord's Prayer, he took up the return of Christ in connection with creedal affirmation VII, 'From thence He shall come to judge'. Edwards was eager to demonstrate that none is better qualified to be the judge of the world than Christ:

> This is the reward of his sufferings here. It is fit that he who was himself judged and condemned for the sins of the world, should be the judge of it. Particularly his Honour is engaged, That those who condemned him be condemned by him. This without question is intended by our Saviour, when being carried before Caiaphas, the ecclesiastical judge, he made no answer but this, "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right-hand of the power, and coming in the Clouds of Heaven", clearly intimating that his future judging of the world […].[37]

---

34 Note fn.5 supra.

35 So for example, *Westminster Confession of Faith* XXXIII, 'Of the Last Judgment', *Westminster Shorter Catechism* Q.28.

36 Acts 17:31.

37 John Edwards, *Theologia Reformata* (London: John Lawrence, 1713), I, 461.

The Congregationalist, Thomas Ridgley (1667-1734) in his *Body of Divinity* (1731) develops at length the fact that Christ's second advent will be a public and unavoidable spectacle:

> We are now to consider that glory with which Christ shall appear, when he comes to judge the world. It is said, he shall come in the full manifestation of his own glory, and of his Father's, with all his holy angels, and with other circumstances which will be very awful and tremendous.[38]

Ridgley's contemporary, the Scot, Thomas Boston (1676-1732) penned similar thoughts in his *Illustration of the Doctrines of the Christian Religion* (published 1767). Boston emphasized that the visibility of Christ's return would be one of the unmistakable features of the return:

> He shall come with observation, in the view of the whole assembled world: for all the kindreds of the earth shall on that day see this mighty Personage with their bodily eyes. None of all the sons and daughters of Adam can possibly avoid this wonderful sight. "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him," Rev. i. 7. [39]

The Baptist, John Gill (1697-1771) in his *Body of Divinity* (1767) develops the second coming of Christ under seven characteristics, the fourth of which is:

> the visibility of Christ's personal appearance; he will appear in human nature; and every eye shall see him, Matt, xxiv. 27, so that he will be seen by all the tribes, kindreds, and nations of the earth.[40]

And finally, (for this purpose), the most popular and influential evangelical theologian of the eighteenth century, the Congregationalist, Philip Doddridge (1702-1751). His *Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics and Divinity* circulated widely both in manuscript and (after 1763) in print. Doddridge's treatment is of interest for more than one reason. His treatment of Christ's return to the world is now part of a discussion of 'last things', rather than (as previously) what could be called the 'states' of Christ. His

---

38 Thomas Ridgley, *A Body of Divinity*, 2 vols (1731; reprinted New York: Carter and Brothers, 1855), I, 631. The structure of Ridgley's work was provided by the questions and answers of the Westminster Larger Catechism.

39 Thomas Boston, *An Illustration of the Doctrines of the Christian Religion*, 3 vols (1767; reprinted London: William Baynes, 1812), II, 97.

40 John Gill, *A Body of Divinity* (1767: reprinted Philadelphia: Delaplaine and Hellings, 1810), p. 422.

subject is, 'What shall pass at the end of the world, so far as Scripture gives us an account of this?' He begins by asserting:

> The Lord Jesus shall descend with visible pomp and majesty, attended by the blessed angels who will probably be employed as the instruments of some loud and extraordinary sound, called in Scripture the 'trump of God' or the voice of the archangel. This appearance shall be attended by the resurrection of the dead.[41]

In sum, we may say that in the first half of the eighteenth century, Jesus Christ's visible return is straightforwardly introduced on Scriptural grounds as the reversal of his earlier humiliation, as the instrument of the last judgment, and as exhibiting his sovereign rule over the last things. This last concept, in particular, is one which will steadily grow as the eighteenth century gives way to the nineteenth. We may therefore ask, 'were not the likes of Irving, Drummond and Way aware of this solid doctrinal teaching in the preceding century?' We cannot know this. But in any case, there was a lacuna in such teaching.

The practical difficulty was that eighteenth century, Christians had not the faintest idea as to when any of this might happen because they had been largely taught an understanding of the last things that reckoned that the last judgment and the return of Christ would only happen after an extended period during which the gospel is victorious in the world as it is spread by messengers empowered by the Holy Spirit. This outlook which one author has called 'The Puritan Hope',[42] while driven by a laudable optimism about the prospects of the Gospel in the world, did nothing to nourish the hope of any near return of Christ. As long as the advance of the Gospel could be observed across the world, it seemed to follow that the judgment day and its precondition, the return of Christ, lay somewhere ahead in the indefinite future. There was just dawning in the age of William Carey the greatest period of global missionary expansion that the Western world had seen, to that date; Latourette called it 'the great century'.[43]

---

41 Philip Doddridge, *A Course of Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics and Divinity*, 2 vols (1763; reprinted London: Robinson, 1799), II, 441.

42 Iain H. Murray, *The Puritan Hope* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1971) demonstrates that this post-millennial vision of the Christian future motivated missionary effort from the Puritan age of the mid-17th century until the late 19th century.

43 Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, 7 vols (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1946). Vol. IV (covering the 19th century) was given this designation.

Charles Simeon, writing on Acts 1:11 ('this same Jesus whom you have seen go into heaven') in 1828 only made explicit what myriads of others had embraced for over a century. Answering the question, 'when may we look for the Lord's return?'

> the Lord Jesus Christ may certainly be expected to come again, *after the manner of his departure* from this lower world [Note: οὕτως ὃν τρόπον.] at the period of the Millennium, to establish his kingdom — Christ laid the foundation of his kingdom in the Apostolic age: and it has been maintained and carried forward, even to the present day. But there is a time coming, when all the kingdoms of the world shall be subdued unto him, and he alone shall reign over the face of the whole earth [Note: Daniel 2:44.]. That I apprehend to be the season called, in Scripture, "the times of the restitution of all things;" till which period the heavens have received him: but when that period shall have arrived, he will again be sent, after the manner of his departure hence [Note: Acts 3:20-21] in power and great glory.[44]

Here, we begin to come close to the source of the aggravation to which our angular premillennialists gave vent. They argued as if their fellow evangelicals had no definite expectation of Christ's return at all when the underlying disagreement was actually about the knowability of the nearness of this event. The angular premillennialists had had their eye on the social and political upheavals of the French Revolution and Napoleonic era; they had already reached the conclusion that these were developments which signalled the approach of the end inasmuch as the church is to be rescued from perils (such as the upheavals of France), rather than basking in prosperity at Christ's return.[45]

B. In 18th Century Enlightenment Protestant Theology

If this analysis goes some way to explain the sense of premillennialist aggravation expressed in the early nineteenth century, there is also a second line of interpretation which can also be explored. That is that in the second half of the eighteenth century, otherwise orthodox Christian

---

[44] Simeon, *Horae Homilecticae* on Acts 1:9-11, <https://www.studylight.org/commentaries/shh/acts-1.html> [accessed 17 September 2020]. It is interesting to note that in Simeon's extended exposition he holds as an open question both 1) whether Christ's return to the world to judge might be a distinguishable occasion from the onset of the millennium and 2) whether the inauguration of the millennium would be set in motion either by Christ in person or by the agency of the Holy Spirit.

[45] W.H. Oliver, *Prophets and Millennialists: The Uses of Biblical Prophecy in England from the 1790s to the 1840s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 13.

theologians (evangelicals among them) come under greater and greater felt pressure to demonstrate that Christian doctrine meets the standard of 'reasonableness'. They acknowledged on the one hand that there are certain doctrines which may be known solely by divine revelation (the deity of Christ, for example). Yet they maintained that those Christian doctrines are surest which have, in addition to scriptural warrant, the concurrence of reason. As this affected the Christian consideration of last things, it led to some unforeseen developments. Christian theologians were confident in asserting that there would be a final judgment, because both Scripture and the universal sense of justice, present in all cultures and religions, called out for such a reckoning and for the lasting consequences following from it. But in such efforts to commend the idea of a universal last things, affecting all civilizations and cultures and yielding enduring repercussions, one can find Christian theologies actually diminishing or erasing the role of Jesus Christ as judge. Jesus Christ's own resurrection from the dead (a truth which we know by inscripturated revelation) is in fact the pattern and guarantee of our own resurrection.[46] But in the determination to establish last things on this preferred 'reasonable basis', the role of Jesus Christ descending from heaven as the agent of resurrection and the judge of all peoples was made to recede. The emphases of the first half of the eighteenth century on Jesus Christ's role in the day of resurrection and judgment were still being sounded by authors such as Samuel Stanhope Smith (1751-1819), the president of the College of New Jersey (from 1896, Princeton University) and Archibald Alexander (1772-1851), first professor in Princeton Seminary.[47] Contemporary Congregationalist theologians, Timothy Dwight (1752-1817) and David Bogue (1750-1825) sounded the same notes.[48] Yet, there were some generally orthodox theo-

[46] The author is very much indebted to James P. Martin, *The Last Judgment from Orthodoxy to Ritschl* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963), p. 49; 'General proofs for a Last Judgment, which could be assumed on a rationalistic basis, prevailed over a thoroughgoing Christological interpretation.'

[47] Samuel Stanhope Smith, *A Comprehensive View of the Leading Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion*, 2nd edn (New Brunswick: Deare and Myer, 1816), pp. 501-19; Archibald Alexander, *A Brief Compend of Bible Truth* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1846), pp. 194-200.

[48] David Bogue's *Theological Lectures*, published posthumously in 1849, represented his lecturing in a theological academy at Gosport, Hampshire from 1789 until his death in 1825. David Bogue, *Theological Lectures*, 2 vols (New York: Lewis Colby, 1849), I, 264-70. One finds the same Christ-centred view of last things in the theological sermons of Timothy Dwight (1752-1817), published as *Theology Explained and Defended*, 5 vols (1818-19; reprinted New York: Carville, 1830), IV, 430-55, note especially p. 443.

logians who seemed to emphasize only those last things to which reason would give its assent. Thus George Hill (1750-1819), professor of Divinity in St. Andrews from 1788, left *Lectures in Divinity* which circulated widely on both sides of the Atlantic. These affirmed the resurrection of Christ as true and historic; yet by the conclusion of his lectures, Hill had confined all consideration of the future to a mere three pages and utterly skirted the question of Christ's role in the last things.[49] His pupil, Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847), professor of theology at Edinburgh from 1828, who is accurately considered as more evangelical than his teacher, chose to avoid the subject of last things entirely.[50]

We may find this marginalization hard to fathom; but at the same time we should recognize that our own contemporary theological reflection upon last things also takes place in a definite cultural and intellectual setting. Our setting is one which disdains anything which is perceived as particularistic or discriminating; the thought that Christ could or would judge the world is deeply troublesome to many. For such reasons, forms of universalism are increasingly attractive to some professed Christians, as well as others.

---

[49] So, George Hill, *Lectures in Divinity* (1821; reprinted New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1851), p. 680. See biographical details of Hill in the article, 'Hill, George' in *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology*, ed. by Nigel M. de S. Cameron (Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1993), pp. 407-08.

[50] Thus Thomas Chalmers' *Institutes of Theology* (Edinburgh: Thomas Constable, 1849) volume II, never reaches the subject of judgment and resurrection. The *Institutes of Theology*, published posthumously after his death in 1847, reflected lectures Chalmers had been giving since 1828 in the University of Edinburgh and subsequently in the New College of the Free Church of Scotland. Early on in this Edinburgh professorship, Chalmers had used the *Lectures* of Hill as the basis of his instruction. Cf. Chalmers' *Institutes of Theology*, II, 261-64. Chalmers had earlier close associations with Edward Irving when, Irving served 1820-1822 as his Glasgow assistant. This was prior to the latter's removal from Scotland to London. Some of these linkages are explored in Crawford Gribben, 'Andrew Bonar and the Scottish Presbyterian Millennium', in *Prisoners of Hope? Aspects of Evangelical Millennialism in Britain and Ireland, 1800-1880*, ed. by C. Gribben, & T. Stunt (Paternoster: Carlisle, 2006), pp. 177-202. The orientation of Hill and his influence upon Chalmers has recently been explored by Mark W. Elliot, 'Natural and Revealed Theology in Hill and Chalmers', in *The History of Scottish Theology*, ed. by D. Fergusson and Mark W. Elliott, 3 vols (Oxford: OUP, 2019), II, 170-85.

CONCLUSION

Drummond, Irving and Way misrepresented matters when they claimed in 1828 that their evangelical contemporaries did not believe in Christ's return. Of two examples (from Thomas Scott and Charles Simeon) which are suggested to lend credibility to their complaint, we have contradictory evidence provided by Simeon's own words.[51] As for Scott's conversational openness to there being no necessity of a physical return of Christ, his published commentaries provide ample evidence that whatever he may have allowed to be possible, conversationally, was at the same time inconsistent with his published remarks intended to explain major New Testament passages. We are therefore amply justified in insisting that the doctrine of the visible, personal return of Jesus Christ was no novelty in late Georgian England.

[51] In addition to Simeon's published expositions of N.T. passages bearing on Christ's second advent cited above, we may stress here that the passage cited from William Carus, *Memoirs of the Life of Charles Simeon* (London: Hatchard & Sons, 1856), p. 658 as indicating lack of conviction on Simeon's part does not in fact show this. Simeon indicates in that place that he was indifferent to the contemporary claim (likely made by the critics cited by Bebbington) that Jesus would return to the world to set up a personal earthly reign, not the second advent itself.

The Reformation in Glasgow in 1559-60

D.W.B. Somerset

What exactly happened in major Scottish towns at the Reformation of 1559-60 is not a subject that is well covered in the literature. Generally there is a disappointing lack of detail in the surviving evidence,[1] and for some towns there are serious inaccuracies in the standard accounts.[2] In the case of Glasgow, one looks in vain for a coherent narrative; and even basic questions are not answered or even considered: for example, when did Protestants begin to assemble for worship; when were the friaries destroyed; and when was the parish church (St Mungo's) reformed and Protestant worship introduced.[3] The purpose of this paper is to answer

---

1 For Ayr, see M.H.B. Sanderson, *Ayrshire and the Reformation* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1997). For Dundee (and Haddington), see I.E.F. Flett, 'The Conflict of the Reformation and Democracy in the Geneva of Scotland, 1443-1610' (M. Phil. thesis, University of St Andrews, 1981); T. Slonosky, 'Civil Reformations: Religion in Dundee and Haddington, c. 1520-1565 (PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 2014). For Perth, see M. Verschuur, *Politics or Religion? The Reformation in Perth, 1540-1570* (Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press, 2006); D.W.B. Somerset, 'John Knox and the destruction of the Perth friaries in May 1559', *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal (SRSHJ)*, 3 (2013), 1-34. For St Andrews, see B. Rhodes, *Riches and Reform: Ecclesiastical Wealth in St Andrews, c. 1520-1580* (Leiden: Brill, 2019). For Stirling, see T. Slonosky, 'Burgh Government and Reformation: Stirling c.1530–1565', in *Scotland's Long Reformation*, ed. by J. McCallum (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 49-68. For Edinburgh, see M. Lynch, *Edinburgh and the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Donald, 1981).

2 See D.W.B. Somerset, 'The "Alteration of Religion" in Aberdeen in 1559: an ancient and persistent historical error', *SRSHJ*, 4 (2014), 1-62, where details of the earlier literature are given.

3 See, e.g., R. Renwick, J. Lindsay, and G. Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, 3 vols (Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson & Co, 1921-34), I, 404-411; *Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513-1625*, ed. by D. McRoberts (Glasgow: Burns, 1962), p. 436. In spite of its promising title, Daniel Macleod, 'Servants to St. Mungo: the Church in sixteenth-century Glasgow' (PhD thesis, University of Guelph, Ontario, 2013) says nothing on the events of 1559-60. The fullest account of the Glasgow Reformation can be found in J. Durkan and J. Kirk, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577* (University of Glasgow Press, 1977), pp. 228-231, but this has several inaccuracies and omissions. The important fact that the Glasgow friaries were reformed on Thursday 29th June 1559 was established by Margaret Sanderson, *A Kindly Place? Living in Sixteenth-Century Scotland* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002), pp. 186-7.

these questions as far as possible. The council records from the period have not survived so we cannot penetrate the internal workings of the burgh, but we glean what there is and establish a sequence of events.[4]

I. BACKGROUND

To envisage the Reformation in Glasgow, we have to re-orient ourselves in two ways. The first is that the centre of Glasgow has shifted probably more than that of any other historic town in Scotland. While their medieval buildings may not have survived, Edinburgh, St Andrews, Aberdeen, Dundee, Stirling, Perth, Ayr, and Inverness all have the modern-day town centre roughly where it was in 1559, but in Glasgow the entire old town has become a backwater. One could live in modern Glasgow long enough without visiting the High Street, the Trongate, the Gallowgate, the Cathedral, and Glasgow Cross. This was the town in 1559-60: there were farms, villages, and castles of the nobility in other parts of what is now Glasgow but in those days they were outside the town.

The second point regards the population. Glasgow now dominates Scotland in terms of population, but in 1559 its population was about 4,500 (according to estimates).[5] For comparison, Edinburgh was about 12,000, Aberdeen about 6,000, Stirling about 1,500, and the total population of Scotland about 650,000. About 7/8 of the people were living in the countryside, and towns were very small by modern standards. In military terms, a powerful landowner could raise enough retainers to defeat an army from any of these towns except possibly Edinburgh.

The main ecclesiastical buildings of Glasgow in 1559 were the Cathedral (much as it is today); the Bishop's Palace or Castle which was near the west end of the Cathedral and survived until 1752; the Franciscan friary or Grey Friars on the west side of the High St between Albion St and Shuttle St;[6] the Dominican friary or Black Friars on the east side of the High St; and the College church, St Mary of Loreto and St Anne, which was on the

---

4 A preliminary version of the material presented here – which has been revised, corrected, and expanded – can be found in Section 5 of D.W.B. Somerset, 'The Scottish Reformation in late June 1559: the destruction of the friaries of Stirling, Linlithgow, Glasgow, and Edinburgh', *SRSHJ*, 5 (2015), 1-33 (see pp. 18-25).

5 *A Tale of Two Towns*, ed. by N. Baxter (Glasgow City Council, 2007), p. 54.

6 For the Franciscan friary, see J. Evans, 'Greyfriars in Glasgow', *Scottish Historical Review*, 3 (1906), 179-193; W. Moir Bryce, *The Scottish Grey Friars*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Sands & Co., 1909), I, 343-351.

south side of the Trongate near the present Tron theatre.[7] The Bishop also had a hunting lodge out at Easterhouse and possibly another residence at Partick Castle.

The Archbishop of Glasgow from 1552 was James Beaton (nephew of Cardinal David Beaton); and his Palace, with the Cathedral precinct, dominated the upper town. There was a division in Scottish Romanism during the 1550s between Archbishop John Hamilton of St Andrews and the more Protestant-leaning 'spirituali' party, on the one hand, and the more reactionary Tridentine-style party on the other.[8] James Beaton belonged to the latter party, and there was also long-standing jealousy between the Hamilton and Beaton families, but how this affected the religious situation in Glasgow is not known. Archbishop Hamilton's half-brother, the Duke of Chatelherault, was the most important person in Scotland after Mary of Guise, being the next in line to the throne after Mary Queen of Scots. He was the Regent of Scotland from 1542 to 1554, but he is usually considered a weak and unstable character.[9] His main residence was at Hamilton, about twelve miles south-east of Glasgow.

There were also tensions between Archbishop Beaton and the Glasgow burgh council from 1553 to 1557 over his ancient right of selecting the Provost and the two baillies from a leet submitted to him by the council. In October 1554 the council elected baillies without consulting Beaton, but the Lords of Council and Session, after extensive enquiry, gave judgement in Beaton's favour in May 1557. As late as 1561 – by which time Beaton had withdrawn to France – the council went through an elaborate show of trying to consult him at the time of the election. Beaton thus exercised a control which made an internal religious reformation in Glasgow almost impossible as long as his power lasted.[10]

---

7 See I.B. Cowan and D.E. Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland* (2nd ed., London: Longman, 1976), pp. 118, 131-2, 207-8, 221-2. For the Dominican friary and the College church, see *Liber Collegii Nostre Domine*, ed. by J. Robertson (Maitland Club, Glasgow, 1846); and for the Bishop's palace, see A.H. Millar, 'The Bishop's Castle', in *The Book of Glasgow Cathedral*, ed. by G. Eyre-Todd (Glasgow: Morison Brothers, 1898), pp. 324-357.

8 D.W.B. Somerset, 'The *spirituali* movement in Scotland before the Reformation of 1560', *SRSHJ*, 8 (2018), 1-43 (p. 37).

9 This view has been challenged, however, in Amy Blakeway's *Regency in Sixteenth-Century Scotland* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), pp. 236-7.

10 J.D. Marwick, *Early Glasgow: a history of the city of Glasgow from the earliest times to the year 1611* (Glasgow: Maclehose, 1911), pp. 83-4; *Charters and Other Documents Relating to the City of Glasgow, A.D. 1175-1649*, ed. by J.D. Marwick (2 parts, Scottish Burgh Records Society, Edinburgh, 1894-1897),

II. EARLY PROTESTANTISM IN GLASGOW

There is very little trace of Protestantism in Glasgow before 1559. John MacDowell attended Glasgow University in 1530 and was Subprior of the Dominicans there, before becoming Prior of the Wigtown house in 1533-4. He probably moved to England in 1534, but his conversion to Protestantism seems to have been later than this.[11] In 1539, a young man named Kennedy, from the archdiocese of Glasgow, was burnt in Glasgow (presumably at Glasgow Cross) along with the Cordelier (Franciscan) friar Jerome Russell from Dumfries.[12]

On 6th February 1557/8, Chatelherault granted a bond of maintenance to Archbishop Beaton and his chapter by which, in consideration of the favour he had to the St Mungo's, 'quhair diverse of our forbearis lyis quhilkis brukit the said office of bailzerie for thair tyme, and als havand consideratioune of this perillous and dangerous tyme quhair detestabil heresies ryses and increasis in the diocy,' and 'beand of gud mynde and purpos, God willing, to repress thaim eftir our power,' he undertook, by 'the faith and truth in our bodies,' to maintain and support the Archbishop, his successors, and the chapter, in all their good, honest, and lawful matters, and to defend them, the privileges of their kirk, their lands, servants, and tenants, against all persons in the realm save the queen and her royal successors.[13] However, the 'detestabil heresies' that the Duke had in mind may not have been in the town of Glasgow itself.

Passing on to 1559, the first Protestant event was the Beggars' Summons, affixed to the doors of the forty-odd friaries in Scotland on 1st January 1558/9 giving the friars notice to quit by Whitsun 1559 (or rather the Friday before, 12th May, called Flitting Friday). The Summons probably originated in Ayr, although it purported to be from the poor of Scotland, from whom the friars had been 'stealing' by begging when they were

---

Part 2, pp. 119-121, 126-129; J.S. McGrath, 'The Administration of the Burgh of Glasgow, 1574-1586' (PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, 1986), pp. 18-21.

11 J. Durkan, 'Some local heretics', *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 36 (1957-58), 67-77 (pp. 67-71).

12 *John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland*, ed. by W.C. Dickinson, 2 vols (London: Nelson, 1949), I, 27. Three Cluniac monks from Paisley Abbey were also accused of heresy at that time, but abjured and went abroad; see J. Durkan, 'Paisley Abbey in the sixteenth century', *Innes Review*, 27 (1976), 110-126 (p. 122).

13 'where divers of our forebears lie which enjoyed the said office of baillie for their time, and also having consideration of this perilous and dangerous time where detestable heresies rise and increase in the diocese', 'being of good mind and purpose, God willing, to repress them after our power'. Marwick, *Early Glasgow*, p. 93; *Glasgow Charters*, Part 2, pp. 125-126, no. 56.

perfectly able to work. In Ayr, the friars were evicted on the appointed day, and probably by coincidence, also in Perth on the day before Flitting Friday, but no attempt was made to enforce the Summons in Glasgow.

When private Protestant worship started in Glasgow is unknown, but on 9th February 1558/9 the Queen Regent, Mary of Guise, ordered that no one was to disturb the Roman Catholic services or to threaten the priests. Glasgow was one of the towns where this proclamation was to be made; the others being Linlithgow, Cupar, St Andrews, Dundee, Montrose, Aberdeen, Irvine, and Ayr.[14] This shows that there was active local Protestantism in these towns, and presumably these Protestants were assembling privately for worship as well. Who they were in Glasgow is not known.

III. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE FRIARIES IN JUNE 1559

The next event in Glasgow Protestantism was at the end of June 1559. Knox's *History* is silent on the reformation in Glasgow, but the account in the *Wodrow Miscellany* says that at the end of June 'my Lord of Glencairn, with the gentlemen of the West Country […] purged the churches in Glasgow of idolatry'.[15] Glencairn was a long-term Protestant sympathiser and one of the principal lords of the Congregation.[16] His main residence was Finlaystone House, near Port Glasgow and now a country park. In 1556 this was one of the places where Knox administered communion, the communicants being Glencairn and his lady, their two sons, and some friends.[17] Glencairn was on his way with Lords Boyd and Ochiltree and the Sheriff of Ayr, Sir Matthew Campbell of Louden to assemble with the Congregation in Edinburgh. The visit to Glasgow seems to have been in passing; Glasgow Bridge with its adjacent fords being the lowest crossing point of the Clyde on the way to Edinburgh. Glencairn and the others probably had a force of at least 1,000 men so they were not going to encounter any serious resistance in Glasgow.

---

14 T. M'Crie, *Life of John Knox* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1855), pp. 359-60.

15 *Miscellany of the Wodrow Society* (Edinburgh, 1844), p. 62. This raid in June was not connected with Chatelherault's joining of the Congregation (contrary to the assertion in Durkan and Kirk, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577*, p. 231) because Chatelherault's change of allegiance did not occur until mid-September; see R.K. Hannay, 'The Earl of Arran and Queen Mary', *Scottish Historical Review*, 18 (1921), 258-276 (p. 266).

16 For an account of Glencairn, see C. Rogers, *Three Scottish Reformers* (Grampian Club, London, 1876), pp. 1-15.

17 Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, I, 121.

Archbishop Beaton was absent from the town by this time. The Queen Regent had been staying with him at the Bishop's Palace in Glasgow at the beginning of May 1559, and Beaton travelled with her from there to Stirling to confront the Protestant preachers. He was with her in Dunbar in July, and in Edinburgh in November, and appears to have continued with her throughout the Reformation struggle, being one of her principal advisors.[18] Even in his absence from Glasgow, there was a formidable Roman Catholic entourage at the Cathedral, including Henry Sinclair, the Dean of Glasgow, and John Steinson (Stevenson), the Precentor.[19]

The date of Glencairn's visit comes from a deposition by John Davidson, former Principal of Glasgow College or University in 1578. In that year, Andrew Melville and others on behalf of the College of Glasgow were involved in a court case to annul a charter of 13th November 1560 in which the Glasgow Dominicans had granted some of their land to a Glasgow burgess.[20] The case was successful and one of the grounds of annulment was that the Dominican buildings had been destroyed long before the charter was drawn up. Witnesses were called to prove this, the most important being John Davidson, then minister of Hamilton, who in 1559 had been Principal of the College. Davidson said that he remembered seeing the Dominican friary pulled down on 29th June 1559.[21] Presum-

---

18 *Wodrow Miscellany*, p. 57; John Lesley, *History of Scotland* (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1830), p. 273; Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, I, 199; *Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots, 1547-1603*, ed. by J. Bain (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1898), Vol. 1 (1547-1563), p. 262 (hereafter Bain, *CSP*).

19 For Henry Sinclair, Bishop of Ross, see *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. John Stevenson, who died at the beginning of 1564, was an important man, being also Provost of Biggar, a former Rector of Glasgow University, and a Senator of the College of Justice; see McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation*, p. 336; J. Durkan and A. Ross, *Early Scottish Libraries* (Glasgow: Burns, 1961), pp. 145-146; G. Brunton and D. Haig, *An Historical Account of the Senators of the College of Justice* (Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1832), p. 96; D.E.R. Watt and A.L. Murray, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae Medii Aevi Ad Annum 1638* (Scottish Record Society, Edinburgh, 2003), pp. 207, 445.

20 Janet Foggie says that the correct date for the annulled charter is not 13th November (the date usually given) but 13th December 1559; see J.P. Foggie, *Renaissance Religion in Urban Scotland: the Dominican Order, 1450-1560* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 291.

21 Sanderson, *A Kindly Place?*, p. 187. See also Durkan and Kirk, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577*, p. 229. Cowan and Easson mention the charter of November 1560 under the Glasgow Dominicans, but then get confused and mention it again under the Glasgow Franciscans, *Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland*, pp. 118, 131.

ably the Franciscan friary was pulled down on the same day. Davidson himself joined the Congregation somewhat abruptly during the summer of 1559, but whether before or after June 29th is not known. A letter written from Paris at the end of September by his former friend, Giovanni Ferreri, bemoans his defection from Romanism as an established fact.[22]

Probably it was the interiors and windows of the friaries that were destroyed, so that the friars could no longer use them, while the buildings themselves were largely intact. The Reformers on their brief visit did not have time to effect the complete destruction of robust stone buildings. An excavation of the Franciscan site in 2003 found a well cut eighteen feet into the ground: the upper part of the well-lining had been removed but the lower half survived, and amongst the rubble thrown into the well were fragments of stained-glass windows and carved masonry from the friary buildings.[23] The Dominican buildings partly survived the Reformation,[24] and the chancel of the Dominican church continued to be used for Protestant worship into the seventeenth century.[25] The Franciscan church was still in existence in 1589 when the burgh council gave directions for its repair.[26]

In November 1559, or sometime afterwards, a royal gift of two barrels of herring was made to the Glasgow Franciscans. This has been interpreted as showing that their convent was still functioning, but similar royal gifts were made at that time to the Stirling and Edinburgh Franciscans, whose buildings had undoubtedly been destroyed.[27] The main

---

22 Durkan and Kirk, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577*, p. 217; McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation*, pp. 330-331. Davidson was the author of *Ane Answer to the Compendius Tractive set furth* […] *by Maister Quintine Kennedy* (1563) in *Wodrow Miscellany*, pp. 175-258.

23 *Discovery and Excavation in Scotland*, 4 (2003), 79. A picture of the excavated well appears in Baxter, *Tale of Two Towns*, p. 60.

24 In February 1561/2, the 'place' of the (Black) friars in Glasgow was said to be 'undemolissit'; and in 1563 their manse and 'kirkroom' were still intact, *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, Vol. 1, A.D. 1545-1569*, ed. by J. Hill Burton (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1877), p. 202; *Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis*, ed. by C. Innes, 4 vols (Maitland Club, Glasgow, 1854), I, 68.

25 Robertson, *Liber Collegii Nostre Domine*, pp. lxvii-lxix; Moir Bryce, *Scottish Grey Friars*, I, 347; McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation*, p. 436.

26 *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow, A.D. 1573-1642*, ed. by J.D. Marwick (Scottish Burgh Records Society, Glasgow, 1876), p. 127.

27 *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, Vol. XIX, A.D. 1557-1567* ed. by G.P. M'Neill (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1898), pp. 140, 142; Durkan and Kirk, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577*, p. 230; Moir Bryce, *Scottish Grey Friars*, I, 372.

purpose of these gifts was probably to alleviate the now genuine poverty of these friars.

The Cathedral and the other churches and chapels were presumably also reformed during Glencairn's visit on 29th June, but only superficially, and their valuables would have been successfully hidden from the Reformers. Roman Catholic worship was probably restored immediately the Reformers had gone.[28]

IV. THE PROTESTANT VISIT IN AUGUST 1559

On 6th August, after the truce or 'Appointment' of Leith, two of the lords of the Congregation, Argyll and Lord James Stewart (later Regent Moray) arranged a 'convention' in Glasgow with Glencairn, Boyd, Ochiltree, and others of Kyle 'for some order to be taken, that the brethren should not be oppressed.'[29] Argyll and Lord James were on their way to Argyll's seat in Inverary. The appointment of this meeting probably implies that the Glasgow Protestants were endeavouring to hold public worship but were being harassed by the (presumably stronger) Roman Catholic party. The intention was to intimidate the Roman Catholics so that they would leave the Protestants alone. Knox does not list Glasgow among the burghs where the ministry was 'established' and the 'sacraments rightly ministered' in his letter to Mrs Lock of 2nd September.[30] At that stage, the worship in the Cathedral was still Roman Catholic.

Of the early Glasgow Protestants, the only one that we can name with certainty is John Davidson, Principal of the University, mentioned above.[31] Perhaps the University building was the place of assembly for Protestant worship. What the friars did after the sacking of their buildings in June is unclear. There is no evidence that they tried to repair them. Of the fifteen or so Dominican friars connected with the Glasgow house in the later 1550s, three held office in the Reformed Church after 1560, but whether these three joined the Congregation in the summer of 1559, we do not

---

28 There were 'more than half a dozen chapels' in Glasgow at the time, Baxter, *Tale of Two Towns*, p. 13.

29 Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, I, 207; Bain, *CSP*, nos. 515, 516. Argyll and Lord James were in Glasgow on 13th August, ibid., no. 525; *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth, 1558-59*, ed. by J. Stevenson (London: Longman, 1865), no. 1186 (hereafter Stevenson, *CSP*). They were in Inverary on 26th August, see *Campbell Letters, 1559-1583*, ed. by J.E.A. Dawson (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1997), pp. 62-3.

30 John Knox, *Works*, 6 vols (Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1846-1864), VI, 78.

31 For John Davidson, see Durkan and Kirk, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577*, p. 216.

know.[32] Another Glasgow man who held office after the Reformation, as reader at St Mungo's from 1561, was Mr James Hamilton who had been a prebend of the College church.

V. THE REFORMATION OF WORSHIP

The Protestant forces in Scotland dispersed in August and re-assembled in Stirling on 15th October. In the meantime time, the French had been fortifying Leith, and the young Earl of Arran had returned from France to Scotland early in September, joining the Protestants with great enthusiasm and persuading his father, the Duke of Chatelherault to support them as well. This accession made the Protestants the strongest political group in Scotland.

With Chatelherault's main residence at Hamilton, the Bishop's Palace at Glasgow became an obvious target for Protestants. There was an expectation that it might contain considerable wealth. On 12th October, Randolph, the English ambassador, reported from Hamilton that 'no money was found in the Bishop of Glasgow's coffers'. This suggests that the Bishop's Palace had recently been seized; and Randolph also says that the castle of the Archbishop of St Andrews was due to be seized that very day.[33]

Bishop Lesley states, however, that it was the following spring that Chatelherault, Arran, and Argyll visited Glasgow 'and caused take down the images and altars and intromitted with the bishop's castle and rents and put in certain gentlemen to keep the same'.[34] This statement has put a number of historians wrong.[35] Lesley was certainly mistaken about the

---

[32] The fifteen Dominican friars were Robert Aitken, James Carruthers, Simon Cornwall, David Dawson, George Denewell, James Fodringham, John Fortune, Mark Hamilton, John Hunter, John Johnstone, John Law, Andrew Leitch, John Macknesthe, John Meek, and George Orwell; Foggie, *Renaissance Religion in Urban Scotland*, Appendix 3, pp. 255-322. Of these, Carruthers became a reader at Eastwood; Fodringham (Fothrington) an exhorter at Covington; and Law a chaplain; see C.H. Haws, *Scottish Parish Clergy at the Reformation, 1540-1574* (Scottish Record Society, Edinburgh, 1972), pp. 259, 272.

[33] Stevenson, *CSP*, no. 76 (3), Randolph to Sadler and Croft.

[34] Lesley, *History of Scotland*, p. 281.

[35] Durkan and Kirk (*The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577*, p. 231) place Chatelherault's arrival in Glasgow in January 1559/60 and McRoberts (*Essays on the Scottish Reformation*, p. 436) and Hay Fleming in March; see D. Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), pp. 390-1. In his more detailed account of Reformation events, however, Hay Fleming shows that Glasgow was in the hands of the Reformers long before

dating because on 5th February 1559/60, about a month before Lesley's date, Archbishop Beaton complains in a deposition to de la Brosse and d'Oysel that his Palace had already been seized by Chatelherault and the fittings removed, and that he had not enjoyed the use of it since the previous Whitsun (14th May).[36] Different dates have been suggested for the seizing of the Palace, but the beginning of October is by far the most likely. An obvious occupation for the Protestant forces while they were assembling for the rendezvous at Stirling was to take possession of the Bishop's Palace in Glasgow.

The annual election of magistrates took place on the Tuesday after Michaelmas (29th September)[37] which in 1559 was the 3rd October, and this seems to have gone ahead much as normal except for the election of three baillies in place of the usual two. These were Master Adam Wallace (continuing from the previous year), John Mure, and James Fleming. John Mure had often been baillie, but this seems to have been the first time for James Fleming. For some reason, Adam Wallace is last mentioned as baillie on 13th December 1559, and James Law appears on 10th September 1560, so perhaps Wallace was taken ill.[38]

The Provost for 1559-60 was probably Andrew Hamilton of Cochnoct who had been Provost since 1551.[39] In February 1549/50 and February 1551/2, he was the Captain of Dumbarton Castle.[40] The other possibility is Robert Lindsay of Dunrod, who was Provost in 1560-61 and 1561-62.[41] Lindsay was present at the Reformation Parliament of August 1560, but the list of commissioners for the Parliament distinguishes him from the

March; D. Hay Fleming, *The Scottish Reformation* (Edinburgh: Scottish Reformation Society, 1903), pp. 73, 81.

36 'Report by de la Brosse and d'Oysel on conditions in Scotland, 1559-1560', in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, Volume 9*, ed. by G. Dickinson (Edinburgh, 1958), pp. 85-125 (p. 102). We are presuming that the house ('maison') to which Beaton refers was his palace rather than his hunting lodge at Lochwood, Easterhouse. Both buildings had been seized by Chatelherault; see R. Keith, *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*, 3 vols (Spottiswoode Society, Edinburgh, 1844-1850), I, 8.

37 *Glasgow Charters*, Part 2, p. 119.

38 *Abstracts of Protocols of the Town Clerks of Glasgow*, ed. by R. Renwick, 11 vols (Glasgow: Carson & Nicol, 1894-1900), II, 71, 72, 74, 90.

39 McGrath, 'The Administration of the Burgh of Glasgow, 1574-1586', Appendix 1.1.

40 *Glasgow Protocols*, I, 9, 40.

41 *Glasgow Charters*, Part 2, p. 127; *Glasgow Protocols*, III, 20.

(unnamed) 'Commissaries of Burrois' which suggests that he was present in his own right rather than as Provost of Glasgow.[42]

The seizing of the Bishop's Palace in October was probably accompanied by the reformation of worship in the Cathedral. What the view of the Glasgow magistrates was on this is unknown. In Ayr, Dundee, and Aberdeen it was the magistrates who introduced Protestant worship in the parish church, but the situation in Glasgow was complicated by the fact that St Mungo's was a cathedral. In any event, it is certain that Protestant worship was introduced by November 1559, when Chatelherault, Argyll, and Glencairn took up permanent residence in the burgh after their flight from Edinburgh on 6th November. It was agreed that they should go to Glasgow, and Arran and Lord James to St Andrews.[43] Glasgow became the centre of the rival Protestant administration set up by the lords of the Congregation of which Chatelherault was the head. Chatelherault was in in Glasgow by the 29th November and Glencairn by 13th December.[44] By 24th December, Glasgow was listed by the Reformers as one of the twenty-two burghs which had declared support for the Congregation.[45] Presumably this decision had been made either by the magistrates or by the burgh council.

VI. THOMAS RANDOLPH'S LETTERS

Further insight into the situation in Glasgow comes from letters from the English diplomat Thomas Randolph, who was based in Glasgow from 25th December 1559 through to the following March, probably staying in the Bishop's Palace. Chatelherault was usually in Glasgow, though he visited his residence at Hamilton from time to time. On 9th January an important French messenger named La Marque was apprehended just

---

42 Keith, *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*, I, 314-15; *The Parliaments of Scotland*, ed. by M.D. Young, 2 vols with continuous pagination (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1992), II, 425. Gibson, who had access to records which have not survived, says that Lindsay of Dunrod was Provost in 1560, but which part of the year he is referring to is not clear; *Glasgow Charters*, Part 1, p. dcxxxiv; John Gibson, *History of Glasgow* (Glasgow: Chapman & Duncan, 1777), p. 390; see also Renwick and others, *History of Glasgow*, I, 410.

43 Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, I, 276, 298.

44 Keith, *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*, I, 246-7; *Glasgow Protocols*, II, 74.

45 Stevenson, *CSP*, no. 485.

north of Berwick and conveyed to Glasgow.[46] He was hoping to see the Queen Regent, but following an interview with Chatelherault, he was detained, presumably also in the Bishop's Palace. On Sabbath 14th January he was moved to Dumbarton Castle for safe-keeping. During his short time in Glasgow, La Marque had asked

> to see the order of the common prayers which are the very same, or differ very little, from those in England. His devotion to them was so little, or his discretion so simple, that he stood whilst other men kneeled upon their knees, with his cap upon his head, looking upon the walls, which so much discontented the congregation that one came unto him and willed him to discover his head or return to his lodging.

La Marque, says Randolph, 'marvels that he finds neither altar nor image, candle nor surplice as he saw in the Queen of England's chapel'.[47] The place of worship was presumably St Mungo's, which had evidently been stripped of its Roman Catholic trappings. The worship was apparently daily, and perhaps conducted by John Davidson. The service-book may have been the 1552 Prayer-Book of Edward VI, somewhat modified along Genevan lines; or possibly copies of the 1556 Genevan Book of Common Order were available.

On 24th January, the lords of the Congregation in Glasgow sent a letter to the Earl of Erroll, stating their position and asking his support. This letter was soon afterwards included in the 'Inquiry' drawn up by de la Brosse and D'Oysel, assisted by Scottish lawyers, with a view to charging Chatelherault and Arran with treason.[48] The signatories of the Glasgow letter were Chatelherault, Argyll, Glencairn, Rothes, Ruthven, Menteith, and Boyd.[49] The same day, they agreed to convene with their armed followers in Glasgow on the following Sabbath, proceeding to Stirling on the Monday to help their beleaguered companions in Fife.[50] Admiral Winter's English fleet had appeared in the Firth of Forth the previous day, however, and the French were in retreat, so their assistance was not needed. By

---

46 'Report by de la Brosse and D'Oysel on conditions in Scotland, 1559-1560', p. 95.

47 Stevenson, *CSP*, no. 615; Bain, *CSP*, no. 616, p. 289.

48 See T.M. Green, *Spiritual Jurisdiction in Reformation Scotland* (Edinburgh University Press, 2019), pp. 17-21.

49 'Report by de la Brosse and D'Oysel on conditions in Scotland, 1559-1560', p. 97. Argyll has passed to his residence in Inverary on 12th January and was still there on 20th January, Stevenson, *CSP*, p. 301.

50 Bain, *CSP*, pp. 298-299.

26th January, Chatelherault was in Linlithgow supervising the impounding of boats in the Firth of Forth to hinder the French withdrawal.[51]

During the French retreat from Fife, a number of prisoners were captured by the Protestants, one of whom was the important Andrew Oliphant, described as 'a faithful chaplain' to Archbishop Hamilton.[52] Oliphant had with him 'a bill of as many as the [Archbishop] had named to be saved from spoiling in Fife.'[53] He was sent to Glasgow for imprisonment. On 10th February, Chatelherault and Arran were at Hamilton and on 23rd February they visited Dumbarton with Argyll to inspect the castle there.[54]

VII. THE FRENCH RAID OF MARCH 1559/60

On 18th March 1559/60 there was a bloody raid by the French soldiers on Glasgow, mainly with the aim of repossessing the Bishop's Palace.[55] According to Lesley, Archbishop Beaton accompanied the raid.[56] The Reformers were taken by surprise, and left Glasgow abruptly, with a small party to defend the Palace and to hold the bridge. The defenders were overrun, however, and those that would not renounce the Congregation were put to death, among them a son of the Earl of Glencairn. The brutal behaviour of the French during this raid did much to alienate support from the Queen Regent. On the departure of the French, the Reformers immediately returned to Glasgow, summoning the neutral lords to join them there on 26th March or at Linlithgow on 30th March.[57]

On 14th April 1560, the Prior of the Glasgow Dominicans, Andrew Leitch, celebrated Easter mass in Leith for the French soldiers during the

---

51 Bain, *CSP*, p. 302 (Croft to Norfolk).

52 Bain, *CSP*, p. 310.

53 i.e., a list of the people whose estates were not to be plundered by the French. For Andrew Oliphant, see Knox, *Works*, I, 64; M.H.B. Sanderson, *Cardinal of Scotland: David Beaton, c. 1494-1546* (Edinburgh: Donald, 2001), p. 105.

54 Bain, *CSP*, pp. 313, 320.

55 *Two Missions of Jacques De La Brosse*, ed. by G. Dickinson (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1942), pp. 83-7; Robert Lindesay of Pitscottie, *Historie and Cronicles of Scotland*, 3 vols (Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1899–1911), II, 168; *A Diurnal of Remarkable Occurrents* , ed. by T. Thomson (Maitland Club, Edinburgh, 1833), p. 56; *Wodrow Miscellany*, pp. 80-1; Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, I, 311.

56 Lesley, *History of Scotland*, p. 281.

57 *State Papers and Letters of Sir Ralph Sadler*, ed. by A. Clifford, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Constable, 1809), I, 713-714; Bain, *CSP*, pp. 340-341.

siege. By this time he was in the pay of Archbishop Beaton.[58] On 18th July 1560, after the death of the Queen Regent, Beaton left Scotland for Paris, where he lived until 1603.[59] At his departure, he took with him a number of important items from Glasgow, including the university mace, the valuables of the Cathedral with a silver statue of St Mungo, and a large number of charters which remained in the trunks in which they had been transported until the 1690s.[60]

It is a puzzle to know how Beaton had these items in his possession. Some writers think that he took them with him when he left Glasgow at the beginning of May 1559; but there was little indication of the violence to come at that stage, and he would have needed remarkable foresight (unless he took them everywhere with him which hardly seems likely).[61] Perhaps he went to Glasgow during the truce in September, but his deposition in February 1559/60 (referred to above) would suggest otherwise;[62] or perhaps the items were smuggled through to him in Dunbar or Leith.[63] The other possibility – and the one that seems most likely – is that these items were well hidden, probably shortly before Glencairn's raid in June, and remained undiscovered in spite of extensive Protestant searches. The Archbishop's deposition speaks of houses neighbouring his Palace being searched for his goods, which shows that the Protestants had not found

---

58 John Lesley, *De origine, moribus et rebus gestis Scotorum libri decem* ([Rotterdam: H. Goddaeus], 1675), p. 524; *Historie of Scotland* […] *by Jhone Leslie* […] *translated in Scottish by Father James Dalrymple*, ed. by E.G. Cody, 2 vols (Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1888-1895), II, 436-7; McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation*, p. 228; Foggie, *Renaissance Religion in Urban Scotland*, p. 291.

59 Bain, *CSP*, no. 876.

60 *Munimenta*, III, 517, 523; J. Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland*, 3 vols (Spottiswoode Society, Edinburgh, 1847-1851), III, 139; M. Dilworth, 'Archbishop James Beaton II: a career in Scotland and France', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 23 (1989), 301-316 (see pp. 311-3); *Miscellany of the Spalding Club*, ed. by J. Stuart, 5 vols (Aberdeen, 1841-1852), II, 369, 370, 374.

61 D. McRoberts, 'The Scottish Catholic Archives, 1560-1978', *Innes Review*, 28:2 (1977), p. 62; M. Dilworth, 'Archbishop James Beaton II: a career in Scotland and France', p. 303.

62 John Hamilton, Archbishop of St Andrews, who had also been with the Queen Regent in Dunbar, visited Hamilton and Paisley at the end of September 1559; Dickinson, *John Knox's History*, I, 199; *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine*, ed. by A.I. Cameron (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1927), pp. 424, 426.

63 Renwick *et al*. suggest that the transmission of these items to Leith or Dunbar was via Blackness castle, *History of Glasgow*, I, 408.

everything in the Palace that they were expecting.[64] If this supposition is correct then the Archbishop's purpose in accompanying the French raid in March was to recover these items from their hiding-place in order to take them to Leith.[65]

The mace was returned to the University in 1590, but the valuables and the charters continued in France until the Revolution of 1790 when most of them disappeared, although some of the charters had been copied by then.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We have seen that the Glasgow friaries were reformed on 29th June 1559, and that Protestant worship was permanently introduced in the Cathedral probably in October, and certainly by November, 1559. The first of these changes required external force, but the second one may have been a regular decision of the magistrates or may have been imposed on the burgh by the lords of the Congregation. By December 1559, however, the burgh had at least acquiesced in the adoption of Protestantism. In July 1560, the Commission of Burghs appointed John Willock as Superintendent for Glasgow, and by 10th October 1560, he was living in the Dean's Manse to the south-east of the Cathedral.[66] He presumably acted as minister in Glasgow at first, and it is likely that John Davidson did the same. Both are recorded in that capacity in February 1561/2.[67] In 1561, the reader in the Cathedral was James Hamilton, mentioned above,[68] and David Wemyss was also appointed minister, probably in 1562.[69]

---

64 'Report by de la Brosse and d'Oysel on conditions in Scotland, 1559-1560', p. 102.

65 For the subsequent history of the archives, see G.G. Simpson and B. Webster, 'The archives of the medieval church of Glasgow: an introductory survey', *The Bibliotheck*, 3 (1962), 195-201. One of the items has entries as late as 1570 and must have remained in Scotland for a time after the Reformation, presumably with Beaton's Chamberlain, Thomas Archibald (p. 197).

66 See letters from Thomas Archibald to Beaton, Keith, *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*, III, 7n, 10; Duncan Shaw, 'John Willock', in *Reformation and Revolution*, ed. by D. Shaw (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1967), pp. 42-69 (p. 61). For a conjectural plan of the pre-Reformation precinct of the Cathedral, see Baxter, *Tale of Two Towns*, p. 61.

67 *Charters and Documents Relating to the Burgh of Peebles, A.D. 1165-1710*, ed. by W. Chambers (Scottish Burgh Record Society, Edinburgh, 1872), p. 275; J. Kirk, *Patterns of Reform* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), p. 103.

68 *Accounts of Collectors of Thirds of Benefices, 1561-1572*, ed. by G. Donaldson (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1949), p. 92.

69 Durkan and Kirk, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1577*, pp. 231-2.

Apart from their intrinsic interest, one of the motives behind 'local studies' of the Reformation is to determine the popularity or otherwise of Protestantism in lowland Scotland. The evidence of this paper would be consistent with a popular Protestantism in Glasgow, held in check by the Roman Catholic strength at the Cathedral; but it would also be consistent with a general lukewarmness in Glasgow requiring the presence of the Congregation to goad it into active support for Protestantism. One Roman Catholic historian asserts that the majority were 'still Catholic' in Glasgow in August 1560 but we have seen nothing to confirm this claim.[70]

The Reformation was a highly significant event for Glasgow. The destruction of the friaries, the reforming of the churches, the permanent exile of the Archbishop, the banishing of the priests,[71] and the establishment of Protestant worship changed the whole face of a town of 4,500 people.

[70] McRoberts, *Essays on the Scottish Reformation*, p. 436. For Gordon Donaldson's response to McRoberts' claim that the vicars choral of St Mungo's repaired the altar of the Name of Jesus in August 1560 (ibid., p. 437), see J. Kirk, *Her Majesty's Historiographer Gordon Donaldson, 1913-1993* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1996), pp. 102-3. McRoberts' claim certainly looks implausible in the light of what we have presented above.

[71] 'All the poor priests that will not recant are banished the town'; Keith, *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*, III, 7n.

De-weaponising Images of Prayer

Ronald T. Michener

Prayer is powerful, we often hear. Believe in the power of prayer! Prayer is a spiritual weapon and churches recruit 'prayer warriors' to fight in spiritual battles.[1] In the album *This Means War*, the 1980s Grammy award winning Christian rock group from the U.S., Petra, included a song, 'Get on your knees and fight like a man'.[2] A weaponised application of prayer has become popular especially in evangelical circles, where there is a

> highly militarized discourse and set of rituals for doing 'spiritual battle' and conducting 'prayer strikes' on the 'prayer battlefield'. […] Spiritual warriors are aggressive prayer intercessors who can pray openly in 'prayer walks' through public spaces, often in urban neighborhoods where poverty and crime are rife.[3]

Elizabeth McAlister suggests that some of this may be traced to the spiritual warfare initiatives of the Third Wave charismatic movement represented by C. Peter Wagner, who taught that 'God is calling prophets and apostles to become intercessors and usher in the return of Jesus and the Kingdom of God through warfare prayer'.[4]

Is this warfare imagery fitting and helpful for the follower of the Jesus who calls Christians to be people who practice and advocate reconciliation?[5] Metaphors, after all, are more than simply rhetorical devices, they have 'semantic power' and 'are cognitive and conceptual

---

1 For a brief history and development of the use of militarised prayer metaphors, for example, in the United States, see Elizabeth McAlister, 'The Militarization of Prayer in America: White and Native American Spiritual Warfare', *Journal of Religious and Political Practice*, 2 no. 1 (2016), 114-130. See especially pp. 119-121. This warfare sensibility is also seen in titles such as: E.M. Bounds, *The Weapon of Prayer* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker 1991), and John Bornschein, *A Prayer Warrior's Guide to Spiritual Battle: The Front Line* (Bellingham, WA: Kirkdale Press, 2016).

2 Petra, 'Get on Your Knees and Fight Like a Man', in This Means War (Star Song Communications, 1987).

3 McAlister, 'The Militarization of Prayer', p. 116.

4 McAlister, 'The Militarization of Prayer', p. 121.

5 Interestingly, E. Janet Warren points out, 'warrior imagery is never applied to Christ or the Holy Spirit. Jesus arrives as a helpless babe and is described as gentle. He teaches love for enemies, prayer for persecutors, and willingly submits to death. And he drives out demons by the 'finger' or 'Spirit' of God, not by warfare. Even in apocalyptic passages, it is the angels who battle, not

[…] frequently unconscious, guiding our thoughts, not just our language'. Warfare imagery, of course, is violent, and may 'evoke the fear, anger, and hatred associated with war'.[6] If this is so, it is important to think about how such metaphors shape a Christian worldview and an understanding of the nature and purpose of prayer, rather than simply uncritically adopting warfare imagery as the accepted norm.

McAlister notes that spiritual warfare language may be 'discursive', but it nonetheless reflects 'cultural and ideological politics' of evangelicals desiring to impact society.[7] The language of spiritual warfare is not whimsically pulled out of a cultural hat; it does have some background in the language of the Bible. After all, the Bible is replete with stories and images of battle and combat. McAlister refers to Ephesians 6:12, that speaks to wrestling not against 'flesh and blood' but against 'principalities and powers'. But the question remains: Must prayer itself be considered the tool or weapon by which to implement this struggle?

The issue of military imagery in Christian speech in general has not remained unaddressed. In June 2000, Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California held a consultation of missiologists, mission leaders and theologians. They concluded

> military-oriented language (words like 'target', 'conquer', 'army', 'crusade', 'mobilize', 'beachhead', 'enemy', and 'battle'), while biblical in many cases, and powerful as mobilizing tools, carry too much downside baggage and need to be replaced by other biblical, descriptive, and powerful terms.[8]

In spite of this initiative, however, the proliferate use of weaponry images for prayer continues to remain popular among Christians worldwide.

When prayer is weaponised it is instrumentalised as a means by which to access the power of God. All applications of power in the context of spirituality and prayer are not necessarily pejorative, but often the verbi-

---

Christ'. E. Janet Warren, ''Spiritual Warfare': A Dead Metaphor?', *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 21 (2012), 289.

6 Warren, ''Spiritual Warfare': A Dead Metaphor?', 284; 291. Warren refers to the work of I.A. Richards, Lakoff and Johnson, and others. Warren's article is helpful in identifying problems with spiritual warfare metaphors, while also suggesting alternatives.

7 McAlister, 'The Militarization of Prayer', p. 121.

8 'Biblical Language and Military Metaphors: Sticks and Stones Revisited'. Unnamed editor. Available from <https://missionexus.org/global-report-sticks-and-stones-revisited-consultation-on-mission-language-and-metaphors/> [accessed 7 October 2021]. An earlier PDF file indicates this originally appeared in *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, October 2000, np.

age of power is applied to prayer indiscriminately. Hence, it is important that we 'give attention to prayer and power because the consequences can be significant, from potential abuse of power to possibly missing out on a way to manage suffering and empower the broken'.[9] In any case, this essay submits that prayer is not a weapon, nor should it be construed as a weapon metaphorically. Further it suggests that prayer is not 'powerful' in the sense that it is often used, as an instrument or tool to implement human desires, however noble those desires may be. It is important to deconstruct the all-too-common posturing of 'power in prayer' to recover and emphasize the Christian discipline of prayer as relational engagement with God.

PRAYER AS A WEAPON?

Does the idea of prayer as a 'weapon' come from Scripture? Prayer as a response to threats of military aggression is where some have drawn their understandings of prayer as an instrument by which to defeat their enemies.

Old Testament Examples

Throughout the Old Testament we see examples of prophets calling upon God with respect to conquering or overpowering those who set themselves up against God's people or did not acknowledge the God of Israel. Samson prays to receive renewed strength to demolish the Philistines (Judg. 16:28); In 1 Kings 8:44, Solomon asks the LORD to 'maintain' the cause of his people in answer to their prayers, when they 'go out to battle against their enemy' (NRSV). When adversaries came upon Elisha, he prayed for the LORD to strike them 'with blindness', which the Lord did in response (2 Kgs 6:18). Jehoshaphat calls upon God in prayer when the army approaches from Edom, and God hears and delivers the people (2 Chr 20:2-15). But simply because we see multiple accounts of God's people praying to God in their distress and hopelessness in times of battle require us to view prayer itself as the weapon of destruction?

Battle Imagery in Paul

The common 'prayer as a weapon' metaphor likely stems from enlarging the focus of the metaphorical 'weapons' of the spiritual warrior described

[9] See Rodney A. Werline, 'Prayer, Politics, and Power in the Hebrew Bible', *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 68 no. 1 (2014), 7-8. Werline provides helpful insights on the relationality of power as 'a human's ability to act on another human or to influence the actions of another human'. It can be 'abusive and destructive' or 'beautiful and life giving' p. 6. Cf. also p. 16.

by the Apostle Paul in Ephesians chapter 6. While Paul is in chains, he nevertheless exhorts his readers to find strength in the power of the Lord, standing strong against the devil and the powers of empire. The irony of Paul speaking these words from prison cannot be missed, as they represent his practice of power reversal, seen for instance in his words about the power of the cross (1 Cor. 1:18). The believer is to put on the armour of God with belt, breastplate, shoes, shield, and sword, all of which are ironic metaphors (considering the Roman occupation) of Christian essentials (truth, righteousness, peace, faith, salvation, word of God) to fight a battle that is beyond 'blood and flesh' (Eph 6:10-17). When the armour is assembled and put on, Paul puts aside the weapon imagery and asks the readers to pray prayers of all sorts and kinds, and to keep on praying for each other and for Paul himself. Paul does not include prayer as one of the weapons to take or put on. Rather it seems that prayer is what one does in, with, before, after, and around everything (Eph 6:18-20). Nevertheless, with Paul's injunction to pray immediately following the armour metaphors for the spiritual battles at hand, it is easy to see why prayer is often added to the arsenal.

Battle imagery, for Paul, however, is not restricted to Ephesians 6. We also see such imagery in Romans 13:12; 2 Corinthians 10:3-5, and 1 Thessalonians 5:8.[10] In Romans 13:12, Paul writes with reference to Christian moral living: 'Let us then lay aside the works of darkness and put on the armour of light' (NRSV). In 2 Corinthians 10:1-5, following Paul's appeal to the Corinthians with 'the meekness and gentleness of Christ' (vs.1) he submits that the weapons used by Christians are 'not merely human' (vs. 4). Again, these words appear to contrast the way of 'empire' with the weakness of the way of the Cross' that will 'destroy strongholds' (vs. 4). Later, in 1 Thessalonians 5:8, in the context of waiting for the coming of the Lord, believers are encouraged to show self-control, and in this self-control (reminiscent of the armour imagery in Ephesians 6), they are to wear 'the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation (NRSV).[11]

It is fascinating how Paul appeals metaphorically to this battle imagery to highlight the counterstrategy of the way of Jesus, which is non-violent 'battle' against personal corruption and the corruption of powers and authorities set against the love of Christ. Yet, in each of these aforemen-

[10] See Tom Wright, *Paul for Everyone: 2 Corinthians* (London: SPCK, 2004), p. 105.

[11] In Ephesians 6:14, however, the breastplate (*thōraka*) is 'righteousness' (*dikaiosynēs*) and the shield (*thyreon*) is faith, while in 1 Thessalonians 5:8, the breastplate is of faith and love (*pisteōs kai agapēs*).

tioned examples, prayer itself is not mentioned as one of the metaphorical weapons used. Furthermore, the armour metaphors in Ephesians 6 are chiefly items for protection and defence, rather than offensive weaponry per se. The only explicit offensive weapon mentioned is the 'sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God' (Eph 6:17), which essentially puts any acts of offense into the hands of God, rather than into the hands of humankind.

The battle and warfare imagery used by Paul is understandable in view of his personal context, being in chains under Roman guard and living under Roman occupation. He understood that the power of Rome would never bring the peace it promised. Rome used armoured guards with swords to demand submission. Rome thought it had the final word using terrorism, torture, and death to convince anyone who thought otherwise. But Paul knew that Caesar was not ultimately Lord and would not, ultimately, have the final word. He also understood that the Kingdom of God does not fight on the same terms of dominance and military power; it rather subverts this power and turns it inside out through the humble life, death, and resurrection of Jesus: the power of the cross. If Paul *had* included a metaphorical, subversive application of prayer as weaponry in this context, it would have been understandable, but he does not use prayer in this manner. Since Paul immediately gives instructions to pray following his use of the weaponry imagery in Ephesians 6, one may argue that this implicitly connects prayer to such weaponry, and hence justifies current applications of weaponry images to prayer. However, this seems unfounded, at least for most Western Christians, as our contexts are clearly dissimilar to the threatening, oppressive context of Imperial Rome and its pervasive military presence. Further, it seems questionable that the pervasive contemporary use of weaponry, battle, or military images to prayer are being used in a subversive, ironic manner similar to that of Paul.

This being said, another perspective may be that it does not matter if we directly draw upon Paul or any explicit reference in Scripture to use the 'prayer as weapon' metaphor, as it is a Christian cultural metaphor just the same. This then brings us to another issue. Is there any harm in using such imagery?

The Dangerous Edge to the Weapon of Prayer

Unfortunately, when we 'weaponise' prayer, it takes on a more instrumental meaning, detached from its relational connectivity to God. In its 'instrumentality' as a militarised tool, prayer is the means by which the conquering of our enemies is made possible. It is a thing used, rather than a disposition of heart in communication with God. Prayer 'warriors' are

called upon to conquer opposing forces by committing to pray frequently, fervently, and for prolonged periods. Theologian J. Todd Billings poignantly addresses this when discussing prayers from others for himself while he was going through cancer treatment:

> At times, I received prayers that seemed to make the one praying the hero of the prayer—as if the 'prayer warriors' were the primary actors in prayer, with God filling an ancillary role. I recall one card that I received with a poem about there being no power on earth 'greater' than the power of prayer. But the eloquent poem made no mention of God. Ouch. Do we believe in God or in the 'power of prayer'?[12]

Praying fervently for a certain cause in the church or for particular ministries or persons in need is certainly important and beneficial to the body of Christ. But we must question the appropriateness of those called as ambassadors of Jesus' gospel of reconciliation applying a 'warrior' metaphor to themselves and others when it comes to prayer.

IS PRAYER *POWERFUL*?

A parallel notion to the weapon imagery of prayer is the notion of the 'power of prayer'. Congregations are encouraged to pray because 'prayer is powerful'. Again, this seems to be using prayer in an instrumental sense. Prayer is a tool used to manipulate orders and systems. By doing 'prayer' we change things. We are challenged to pray because of the inherent power in the tool of prayer. Power accomplishes things, and since prayer is powerful, we must use it for our purposes. After all, there is no disputing James 5:16. It says the prayer of a righteous person is 'powerful and effective'. That is, prayer is able (*ischyei*) to effectively bring about results. But does this mean prayer is something to be used as a means of power to manipulate circumstances or persuade God? What then is prayer effective to accomplish?

Prayer is not 'powerful' in and of itself as an instrument, but prayer is ultimately a way to acknowledge the power of God in our humble posturing before him. God is powerful, we are not. The preceding context of James 5:16 refers to the believer in trouble, illness, or in sin. Believers are called upon to pray for each other with respect to such matters 'in the name of the Lord' (vs. 14). When someone is sick, we see that the 'prayer of faith will save the sick'. But this is clearly not reducing prayer to a mere instrumental tool. In this context it is only after prayer of the elders, with

[12] J. Todd Billings, *Rejoicing in Lament: Wrestling with Incurable Cancer and Life in Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2015), 117.

faith in God, that 'the Lord will raise them up' (vs. 15). Further, this is not an outright guarantee of healing, no matter what, if such a prayer is uttered. As Douglas J. Moo points out: 'A true prayer of faith, then, always includes within it a tacit acknowledgment of God's sovereignty in all matters; that it is *God's* will that must be done. And it is clear that is by no means always God's will to heal those who are ill (cf. 2 Cor. 12:7-9)'.[13] The only reason prayer contains an ability or power to accomplish things is because of the way by which we, in our weakness, call upon God to help, heal, and guide. This does not seem to be 'power' in the sense of a tool or weapon, but power in terms of ability or strength to point toward and rely upon God's power to intervene.

PRAYER AS POSTURING HUMILITY: PHENOMENOLOGICAL INSIGHTS FROM MEROLD WESTPHAL

Prayer must not be reduced to an instrumental activity of a human being and must not be construed as containing some inherent power within itself. Prayer is rather about placing ourselves in a position of weakness before a God who is indeed powerful beyond our comprehension and control. Rather than looking at prayer through the scope of a weapon or using it as tool of power, it is better suited to understand prayer as a human posturing of weakness. Prayer provides the occasion to express our weaknesses, needs, and our ultimate reliance on God's power. The strength of prayer lies in the weak, selfless 'power' of the cross. In this sense, the notion of power is not completely absent from prayer, but it is a subversive power, a power of embracing the power of God's self-giving love. As Stanley Hauerwas aptly says: '[W]e are about *power*, and there is no need for a false humility among Christians about our lack of power. Servanthood is power insofar as it is obedience to the One who is the way, the truth, and the life'.[14]

Merold Westphal refers to the humble positioning of prayer, calling it 'a deep, quite possibly the deepest decentering of the self, deep enough to begin dismantling or, if you like, deconstructing that burning preoccupation with myself'.[15] Westphal develops this thesis phenomenologically

[13] Dougles J. Moo, *James: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1985), p. 187.

[14] Stanley Hauerwas, *Resident Aliens: Life in the Christian Colony* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1989), p. 167.

[15] Merold Westphal, 'Prayer as the Posture of the Decentered Self', in *The Phenomenology of Prayer*, ed. by Bruce Ellis Benson and Norman Wirzba (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005), p. 15.

by reflecting on the prayers of Samuel, Mary, and surprisingly, but not irreverently, Elvis.

Recounting the prayer of Samuel in 1 Samuel 3, Westphal reminds us that this is a prayer of response to God's initial call to Samuel. In this instance, we do not see prayer as a request to God for some personal want or need, but as a responsible turning of an ear toward God, listening to God's call.[16] The content of Samuel's prayer to the Lord may be simply summarized as 'I'm here, speak Lord, I'm listening'. In this act of acknowledging God, there is a decentring of the 'transcendental ego' — it is not about 'me' or my intentions, but about 'a reverse intentionality in which I am the intended one rather than the intending one'. God is the one first beckoning me, and prayer is the decentred self, responding and continuing to listen to the God who calls. This is not something that is mastered by simply expressing agreement to listen to God, but something that is, as Westphal puts it, 'the always unfulfilled task of a lifetime'.[17] This points to the need of silence in prayer, for we need silence before God in order to practice the discipline of listening to God.[18]

Next, Westphal refers to the prayer of Mary, commonly called the Magnificat, found in Luke chapter one. Westphal submits that this prayer is dependent on the prayer of Hannah in 1 Samuel 2, and it is also linked to the prayer of Samuel previously mentioned in 1 Samuel 3. Mary's prayer is a humble response to God's initial call to her, similar to the 'I'm here Lord' of Samuel. By presenting herself to God and away from other distractions, she willingly decentres herself to be available to God.[19] Likewise, Westphal points out that Mary's prayer manifests 'silence before the divine word' just as with the prayer of Samuel, as she 'treasured' and 'pondered' these things 'in her heart'.[20]

The final prayer he considers is that of Elvis, which expresses the 'I want you and need you' desire of prayer. Westphal, however, re-appropriates the egoistic eroticism of the Elvis 'prayer' and situates it within the context of Psalms 42 and 63, where the soul 'longs' 'thirsts', and 'faints' for God. The context of these passages is not about possessing God as an object to be taken, but about giving oneself fully to God in order to be fully available to him.[21] Again, this is the 'the posture of the decentred self' — the self that moves away from itself as the basis on which 'mean-

16 Ibid., p. 17.
17 Ibid., p. 19.
18 Ibid., p. 20.
19 Ibid., pp. 22-23.
20 Ibid., p. 27. Westphal quotes from Luke 2:19 (NRSV).
21 Ibid., pp. 28-29.

ing, and truth, and goodness are defined'.[22] Jean-Louis Chrétien describes it in this way: 'All prayer confesses God as giver by dispossessing us of our egocentrism, and it does so with a word that the addressee alone renders possible in each moment of its enactment'.[23] It is only after God lays claim over the individual, that the individual may claim that 'He is mine'.[24]

In all three prayers, prayer is not about exerting personal authority nor is it strongly asserting one's individual requests towards God. In these examples, prayer is not the act of the individual with strong faith in order to implement actions or reactions from a God who is ready to perform according to our spontaneous whims and requests. It is rather a positioning or posturing of oneself in humility before the God to whom we must be disposed in our weakness and poverty. This posturing does not devalue the human being, but it situates the human being fully within the context of the imago Dei, where dependence upon God within creation allows the human being to fully flourish as intended by the Creator.

PRAYING IN THE KINGDOM WITHOUT WARRIORS AND WEAPONS

De-weaponising the Battle Chief: A Weak and/or Vulnerable God?

Perhaps the use of militarised prayer metaphors stem from, in addition to how we understand prayer, how we understand and characterize the God to whom we pray. The manner in which we think about God as 'All Powerful' affects the way we think of prayer as a means to harness power or used as an instrument of power. If God is consistently portrayed and understood as Warrior-Conqueror and Battle Chief, will this not affect our understanding of how we invoke such a God? In asking such questions, we are not denying God's power and might as described in the clas-

[22] Ibid., pp. 30, 31.

[23] Jean-Louis Chrétien, 'The Wounded Word: Phenomenology of Prayer', in *Phenomenology and the 'Theological Turn'* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2000), p. 153.

[24] Westphal, 'Prayer as the Posture of the Decentered Self', p. 30. Jean-Louis Chrétien says it this way: 'One can be turned to God only in praying, and one can pray only by being turned toward God' ('The Wounded Word', p. 157). With the above focus on prayer as an individual, decentred response to God's call, it is important not to reduce prayer to the individual subject before God. We are Christians within a community of believers who pray by affirming '*Our* Father in heaven'. Chrétien makes this point by referring to Cyprian, *De dominica oratione* 8, quoted in Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIa IIae, q. 83, art.7, ad 1um ('The Wounded Word', p. 155).

sical theological attributes. However, we are suggesting that the manner in which God as 'powerful' is rendered and applied requires further reflection, and perhaps, reconsideration. A philosopher/theologian who may help us with such reflection and reconsideration is John D. Caputo, to whom we now turn.

John D. Caputo

Caputo's work, *The Weakness of God*, emphasizes a weak notion of God, a God which is not a metaphysical, supernatural being, but is rather an event. This event, as Caputo says, is 'of a call rather than of a cause, of a provocation or a promise rather than of a presence'.[25] Caputo appears worried about the hidden power structures (used to oppress others) associated with seeing God as a supreme 'Being' along with its historically contingent limitations.[26] God as an event, is not constrained by such limits. God as an event is carried out in the 'kingdom of God' — a 'weak force' calling us, nonetheless passionately, out of our comfort zones for the sake of that kingdom, where it is translatable and undetermined.[27] It is, Caputo says, a kingdom of weakness that shows ironic strength by a 'law of reversals' where the 'first is last, whatever is out is in, whatever is lost is saved […] which confounds the dynamics of strong forces'. In the weak kingdom of Jesus, 'patience and forgiveness' reign and 'war and aggression are met with an offer of peace'.[28] It is not a kingdom of imperialism, force, and military power, but a kingdom that quietly subverts empire by turning things inside-out and upside down, ushering in a new way of being human.

There is much we wish to affirm about Caputo's rendering of the weak aspects of the kingdom of God. We strongly adhere to Caputo's notion of a 'weak' kingdom without accepting his view of a God who is reduced to an event rather than understood as a personal God. There is much to glean from a God who is vulnerable and works through weakness. These weak aspects of the kingdom of God are critical to a demilitarised perspective of prayer. However, in our view it is equally important to maintain belief in a personal, relational God to whom we pray. In order to highlight this

---

25 John D. Caputo, *The Weakness of God: A Theology of the Event* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006), p. 12.

26 Ibid., pp. 9, 13, 34. These limitations lie in the cultural and contextual factors that name such a God.

27 Ibid., pp. 9-11. See also my comments on Caputo regarding the humble aspects of the kingdom of God in Ronald T. Michener, 'The Kingdom of God and Postmodern Ecclesiologies: A Compatibility Assessment'. *Evangelical Review of Theology*, April 2010, 119-130.

28 Caputo, *The Weakness of God*, p. 15.

more adequately, it will be helpful to contrast William Placher's 'Vulnerable God'[29] with Caputo's God of weakness.

William Placher

Placher begins his book, *Narratives of a Vulnerable God*, by reminding us that God became human in Jesus, displaying for us the fullness of humanity 'not in quests of power and wealth and fame but in service, solidarity with the despised and rejected, and the willingness to be vulnerable in love'.[30] Unfortunately, Christians have often pitted the powerful God of the Old Testament against the Jesus of the New Testament, distorting both the notion of what it means for God to be powerful, and distorting the personal nature of God. Placher does not minimize the complexities of such distortions, however, since both images have been culturally and/or theologically emphasized. The God who is all powerful is invoked for political means to defend a nation's 'rights' for war. The Jesus who died on the cross is the esteemed example of servanthood, sacrifice, and humility in the face of suffering and injustice.[31] Explaining the multiple reasons for this frequent false disjunction between God and Jesus is beyond the scope of this present work. But we affirm that Jesus is God in the flesh, revealing 'God's own self in human form'.[32] Assuming this position, it is reasonable to say that we can interpret God's person and actions in view of how he expresses himself in the person of Jesus.

Placher refers to the book of Revelation, which contains images of power and conquest that are applied to the Son of Man (understood as the resurrected, returning Messiah, Jesus). He notes that the triumph of the Son is the triumph of the Lamb, the one crucified — the same God who has been in continual struggle with his people Israel through the ages. This is not to say that these are only pseudo images of power and warfare, 'but the victories are victories of the Lamb who has been slaughtered'. Placher points out that first century Hellenism sought deities that would triumph over their adversaries by conquering them with political or military power, much like today. Jesus manifests the full presence of God, yet equally displays 'human powerlessness'. Referring to the progression of events in the Passion Narrative, Placher's words remind us of Caputo's rendering of the kingdom of God, as 'the story implies an odd inverse proportion, for that moment when it seems that Jesus can do nothing at

---

29 William C. Placher, *Narratives of a Vulnerable God: Christ, Theology, and Scripture* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994).

30 Ibid., p. xiv. Cf. also p. 15.

31 See Ibid., pp. xv, 5-6.

32 Ibid., p. 7.

all is the culmination of his work as savior of the world'.[33] This is not the obliteration of power completely, but it is power reconstrued. It is power exercised by the weakness of the cross; but through this weakness, the world is changed.[34] God does not lack strength or power to accomplish what he wills in love, but the way in which we render God's power and seek such power in our lives must be nuanced through the suffering God on the cross.

Placher points out that humans seek of power because of the vulnerable fear of lacking control. We exercise power at our disposal because we fear damage, pain, or loss — whether persons, status, or things important to us. God's power, however, comes in his power of vulnerability and love, not in domination or manipulative control.[35] Placher notes this possible irony displayed by Thomas in John chapter 20, when he utters the words to Jesus, 'My Lord and my God'. Such words could have easily been applied to the emperor, but Thomas applies them to Jesus as he is confronted with Jesus' wounds — 'a reminder yet again of the challenge that the Gospels embody to the usual assumptions about power'.[36] Placher, like Caputo, highlights the ironic, upside-down power of weakness, compassion, suffering, and forgiveness as trademark attributes of God's restorative Kingdom.

So far so good as to their compatibility. But Placher's God is explicitly revealed personally in Jesus, unlike Caputo's God of the event. Jesus is significant for Caputo, but not as the second person of the Triune God. Jesus is rather 'a prophetic teacher and enactor of the 'event' that breaks open the horizons that hem us in or bind us up, a parabolic figure of breaking with the dead works that kill, thereby letting something new, unforeseen, and unanticipated break in'.37 On the other hand, for Placher, God is not simply a way of naming the event of the kingdom, but God reveals himself as a loving, relational, personal being in Jesus, who truly is God in the flesh and extends his love to us.[38]

With such de-emphasis on strength and power (at least in terms of power as the exercising of control) we may nonetheless be drawn to ask

---

33 Ibid., p. 9 (cf. also p. 8); pp. 9-10; 16 (cf. also p. 15); p. 15.

34 Ibid., p. 17. Here Placher cites Daniel Migliore who claims that God's power 'is a strange power' that 'is made known above all in the weakness of the cross of Jesus', in Daniel Migliore, *Faith Seeking Understanding* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 52.

35 Ibid., pp. 18-19.

36 Ibid., p. 103.

37 Caputo, *The Weakness of God*, p. 129.

38 See Placher, *Narratives of a Vulnerable God*, p. 20.

how a God of vulnerability and suffering may truly help or deliver us.[39] Placher submits that God's suffering and vulnerability stem from God's loving action; power itself does not guarantee loving action or redemption.[40] Placher insists that the loving, vulnerable God remains able to be loving and vulnerable through all time, although remaining 'neither timeless nor in time in the same way we are'. At the same time, he also presumes this God is 'a personal God' who is engaged in 'at least some of the following things: remembering, anticipating, reflecting, deliberating, deciding, intending, hoping, sympathizing'.[41] God's power to rescue is clearly power, but it is power that works weakly through 'strong' traits of vulnerability and love. Such traits can only be manifested in God who is obviously different than humans, yet ironically and clearly reveals himself through humanity in the incarnate Christ Jesus.

Placher's insights help us consider how our thinking about God as all-powerful influences the way we think of prayer as an instrument of power, or as the means to harness power for personal ends (even if those personal ends are for the sake of others). This is not to imply that God is not powerful and almighty but should leads us to consider how the notion of power is rendered and applied to God.[42] Prayer then would not be about harnessing warriors and weapons, but about peace-making postures, positioning ourselves (individually and in community) humbly before the God who sacrifices for us and seeks relationship with us.

Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834)

There are some insightful thoughts in this regard from a sermon of Friedrich Schleiermacher: 'The Power of Prayer in Relations to Outward Circumstances'[43] from Matthew 26:36-46 (Jesus praying in the Garden of Gethsemane prior to his arrest). With an initial glance at the title, it

---

39 Ibid., p. 18. Placher refers to Joan Northam on this point, as she reflects on the need for a God who can rescue her if she were in a pit with a broken arm. She says that she would want 'a Rescuer with a very bright light and a long ladder, full of strength, joy and assurance who can get me out of the pit, not a god who sits in the darkness suffering with me'. Joan Northam, 'The Kingdom, the Power and the Glory', *Expository Times*, 99 (1988): 302.

40 Placher, *Narratives of a Vulnerable God*, p. 18.

41 Ibid., p. 31 (cf. p. 27); p. 29.

42 That is, if God is rendered 'powerful' apart from the weak 'power of the cross' then the nature or characteristics of the attribute of 'power' may be misconstrued.

43 Friedrich Schleiermacher, 'The Power of Prayer in Relations to Outward Circumstances', in *Selected Sermons of Schleiermacher*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, The Foreign Biblical Library (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 2010), Kindle edition, pp. 38-52.

may seem ironic to refer to this sermon to enhance our position. Schleiermacher, however, formulates his comments in such a way that his message supports our aforementioned concerns. Near the beginning of the sermon, he affirms that if we have been protected from evil as a result of our prayers, this is indeed due to the 'power of prayer'.[44] He continues, however, to ask whether there is another sort of power to prayer — for example, using prayer as a means to fulfil our wishes. This is where he exhorts his listeners to not expect more from prayer than that which was gained by Christ in Gethsemane.[45] He insists that where Christ's prayer 'could not prevail neither will ours succeed'. Of course, 'success' in this context is relative to the expectations or personal desires of the one praying. For Schleiermacher it is good, and in fact, a 'privilege' to express our personal desires to God that are in accordance with 'the thought of God',[46] but the request(s) for which one asks will not necessarily take place simply because one prayed. Our prayers must always defer to God's will, just as Jesus in the garden. Jesus desired to avoid suffering, but his desire was qualified by his acceptance and surrender to God's will.[47] We must follow this pattern of submission to God in our prayers as well.

When we make intercessions and supplications to God, we are looking for God to accomplish things seemingly beyond our abilities, understanding that God's power surpasses our inabilities. So regrettably, prayer's power lies in one's supposed access to God's power in such a way that this power works in a manner that is favourable to our requests. But, as Schleiermacher says, 'there lies at the bottom of this a defective idea of God. If we called to mind what should always come most readily to our thoughts — His holiness and wisdom — our wish would quickly take the form by which the prayers of pious men must always be distinguished'.[48] Schleiermacher makes clear in this sermon that our prayers, just as Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane, are not to be used as instrumental tools; they are instead honest expressions from the heart, rooted in the desire for relationship with God.[49]

44 Ibid., p. 38.
45 Ibid., pp. 39-40.
46 Ibid., pp. 40, 41, 39.
47 Ibid., pp. 42, 43-44.
48 Ibid., p. 49.
49 Ibid., pp. 49-50.

De-weaponising Prayer through Confession, Adoration, Thanksgiving, and Lament

The notion of prayer as 'powerful' or prayer as a 'weapon' seems typically applied to prayers of intercession or supplication. When invoking God, prayer has power to 'do things' for others or ourselves as we ask God to intervene, functioning as a *Deus ex machina*. That is, prayer functions to bring about an intervention from God to accomplish that which otherwise could not be accomplished with our own devices. Interestingly, prayer does not seem to take on weaponised or utilitarian metaphors when applied to forms of prayer such as confession, adoration, thanksgiving, or lament. How often do we hear of one saying we ought to give thanks to God for his mercy in our lives because of the 'power of prayer'? Likewise, personal or community expressions of sorrow and grief to God do not seem to refer to prayer as a force or weapon. Yet, such 'weak' postures of prayer, such as confession and lament, are salient aspects of prayer.

Again, this highlights that prayer must be construed relationally, rather than instrumentally as if it were a tool or weapon to accomplish things. When we are offering praise for God's being and works or expressing thanks to God, the motive is not to accomplish something for ourselves or others; it is to express gratefulness.[50] Rowan Williams aptly speaks to this when he describes worship as that which 'ascribes supreme value, supreme resource or power, to something other than the worshipper, so that liturgy attempts to be a "giving over" of our words to God (as opposed to speaking in a way that seeks to retain distance or control over what's being spoken of)'.[51]

Prayers of confession may be indirectly construed as asking God for a personal response of forgiveness, but this would not typically be construed as an act of 'power' for the sake of oneself or others. This is not to say that gratefulness or confession do not accomplish something within the human person, such as developing a spirit of humility and respect. But the basic assumption behind the act of confession is that personal change has already been implemented, or has begun to be implemented, before such prayers are offered. Personal change itself, however, does not seem to be the primary motive for prayers expressing words of thanksgiving and confession.

---

[50] Schleiermacher submits that our petitionary prayers must be like our prayers of thanksgiving in that they must 'replace eager desire with quiet submission'; ibid., pp. 48-49.

[51] Rowan Williams, *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), p. 7. Cf. also Ashley Cocksworth, *Prayer: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2018), p. 67.

So not only are weaponised understandings and expressions of prayer often misguided when applied to intercessions, supplications, and confessions, they also do not appear to fit meaningfully into primary areas of prayer that are exemplified in the book of Lamentations or the Psalms. Prayers of lament and sorrow are also not demonstrative acts that are usually associated with the 'power of prayer' vocabulary. They are instead utterances of the human person's suffering, weakness, and anguish before their Creator — it is prayer acknowledging power apart from oneself.

Is there power in prayer? Perhaps if power is the act of our will to submit to God in our weaknesses and vulnerabilities understanding we cannot manipulate the outcomes — then indeed, there is power in prayer.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

This essay has provided a cursory attempt to deconstruct a militarised view of prayer. Prayer is not a weapon, and it is not inherently powerful as some sort of instrument to manipulate circumstances. Admittedly, we have not advanced a 'constructive' theology of prayer or provided guidelines for the practice of prayer. Regardless, it is our hope that by resisting weaponised images of prayer, we may learn more constructive postures of humility before God and others as we struggle to practice prayer amidst of our weaknesses in a broken world. If that is all we can do, this is no small part of prayer.

The Assessment of Charles Hodge Concerning the Doctrine and Character of Friedrich Schleiermacher: A Liberal Theology and a Believing Heart

Mark J. Larson

Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) was one of the most prominent theologians in the history of the church. Karl Barth asserted that Schleiermacher 'did not found a school, but an era.'[1] He added, 'The nineteenth century in the theological field' was 'his century.'[2] It has been properly noted that he was 'the pioneer of liberal Protestant theology.'[3] Ritschl, Herrman, Troeltsch, Tillich, and many other theologians were impacted by him.[4] His influence was also felt in the pulpits and pews of the churches, especially in the United States. Ronald Nash put it this way: 'He came to be regarded as the fountainhead of one dominant form of liberalism, namely, the view that it doesn't matter what a person believes, it is what he *feels* that is important.' Nash described his effect in colourful language: 'Liberals who shared this view and regarded Schleiermacher as its proximate source, descended on the pulpits of many established churches in America like a plague of locusts.'[5]

The scholarly literature frequently notes that neo-orthodox theologians, such as Karl Barth and Emil Brunner, attacked Schleiermacher's lib-

---

1 Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History* (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1972), p. 425.

2 Ibid., p. 25.

3 Brian A. Gerrish, 'Theology within the Limits of Piety Alone: Schleiermacher and Calvin's Doctrine of God', in *Reformatio Perennis*, ed by Brian A. Gerrish (Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1981), p. 67.

4 Richard B. Brandt, *The Philosophy of Schleiermacher* (New York and London: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1941), p. 307; Bernard M. G. Reardon, *Religion in the Age of Romanticism: Studies in Early Nineteenth Century Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 55; Friedrich Schleiermacher, *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers*, trans. Richard Crouter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. xxxii; Michael Root, 'Schleiermacher As Innovator and Inheritor: God, Dependence, and Election', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 43 (1990), 87.

5 Ronald H. Nash, *The Word of God and the Mind of Man* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p. 31.

eral theology.[6] Barth, for example, made this statement: 'I can see no way from Schleiermacher […] to the chroniclers, prophets, and wise ones of Israel, to those who narrate the story of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, to the words of the apostles—no way to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the Father of Jesus Christ.'[7]

THE POLEMICAL RESPONSE OF CHARLES HODGE

Although significant attention has been given to the anti-Schleiermacher discourse of Barth and Brunner, the polemical activity of Charles Hodge, the renowned theologian at Princeton Theological Seminary, has been largely ignored.[8] There is much to be gained, however, by considering the fundamental elements of Schleiermacher's theology and the way in which Hodge interacted with his positions. For one thing, unlike the neo-orthodox theologians of the twentieth century, Charles Hodge (1797–1878) was a contemporary of Schleiermacher. Furthermore, Hodge actually knew him—meeting him for the first time on April 18, 1827, at the University of Halle.[9] Then, four months later, on October 14, Hodge heard Schleiermacher preach. At the time, Hodge was two months short of his thirtieth birthday, while Schleiermacher was one month short of his fifty-ninth birthday. Hodge recorded his impressions in his journal: 'I went to hear Schleiermacher, not knowing of any more evangelical preacher who had service in the morning.' 'The sermon was peculiar,' wrote Hodge. 'The words were Biblical,' he observed, 'but the whole tenor so general, the ideas so vague and indefinite, that it was impossible for me to understand

---

6 Keith Clements, *Friedrich Schleiermacher: Pioneer of Modern Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987), p. 63; Brian A. Gerrish, *Tradition and the Modern World: Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1978), pp. 13–48; Van A. Harvey, 'A Word in Defense of Schleiermacher's Theological Method', *The Journal of Religion*, 42 no. 3 (1962), 151; Dawn DeVries, *Jesus Christ in the Preaching of Calvin and Schleiermacher* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), p. 4.

7 Karl Barth, *The Theology of Schleiermacher* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1982), p. 271.

8 Annette G. Aubert, 'Old Princeton and Reformed Orthodoxy', *Westminster Theological Journal*, 74 (2012), 151.

9 Archibald Hodge, *The Life of Charles Hodge* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880), p. 128. Schleiermacher had come from Berlin for the celebration of what Hodge called 'the Jubilee of Niemeyer, the Chancellor of the University, who has now completed the fiftieth years of his academic life' (Ibid.).

exactly what he meant.'[10] Even more than hearing one sermon, Hodge made the point that he 'often attended Schleiermacher's church.'[11]

Long before Barth and Brunner were born, Hodge had worked extensively with Schleiermacher's theology, offering an analysis in which he severely criticized its perceived weaknesses from the perspective of the traditional teaching of the Reformed faith.[12] Hodge, as we shall see, firmly rejected the Christian character of Schleiermacher's theology. Nevertheless, in a somewhat surprising turn, Hodge came to believe at a later point in his career that Schleiermacher the man was truly a Christian. How shall we understand Hodge's thinking from the standpoint of the classical Reformed doctrine that he embraced?

Hodge recognized that Schleiermacher did not have *fides generalis*, a faith that believes 'all that God in the Bible declares to be true.'[13] He acknowledged that 'all Christians are bound to believe, and that all do believe everything taught in the Word of God, so far as the contents of the Scriptures are known to them.'[14] How is it then that Hodge expressed his confidence that Schleiermacher was a saved man, even though he did not accept the divine authority of Scripture?

The thesis of this essay is that Hodge in the case of Schleiermacher was applying the position of Protestant Scholastic theology regarding *fides specialis*. Special faith or saving faith, insisted Hodge, was what was 'necessary to salvation.' The object of a faith that saves is Christ: 'The special definite act of faith which secures our salvation is the act of receiving and resting on Him as He is offered to us in the Gospel.'[15] 'Receiving Christ' is 'the specific act required of us in order to salvation.'[16] Hodge at this point was essentially reiterating the teaching of Francis Turretin who wrote about the soul receiving Christ and adhering to him: 'This is the formal and principal act of justifying faith, usually termed "reception."'[17]

---

10 Ibid., p. 152.

11 Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975), II, 440.

12 Schleiermacher acknowledged the revolutionary nature of his ideas and that they were not in continuity with historic Protestantism. He said, 'I fully deny my profession in all that I say to you.' He admitted that when he 'began to examine the ancestral faith,' he had to 'purify' his 'heart of the rubble of primitive times' (*On Religion*, p. 4).

13 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, III, 96.

14 Ibid., p. 95.

15 Ibid., p. 96.

16 Ibid., p. 97.

17 Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol. 2, trans. George Musgrave Giger (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1994), pp. 562–63.

Since Hodge was convinced that Schleiermacher had received Christ, he believed that he should be regarded as a saved man. Hodge in the case of Schleiermacher was willing to see an exception to the general rule as to how saving faith functioned in relationship to the Bible.

NOTHING MORE THAN A PHILOSOPHICAL THEORY

We need not guess as to what Hodge's initial impression of Schleiermacher's theology actually was. One month before he met Schleiermacher for the first time, Hodge recorded an interesting statement in his journal, dated March 14, 1827. He made reference here to August Tholuck, a professor of theology who began his teaching career at Halle in the previous year.[18] 'Tholuck read several passages for me from Schleiermacher's Dogmatik, but they seemed to me to darken counsel by words without wisdom.'[19] This, indeed, was Hodge's complaint regarding modern German theology in general. It was characterized by ambiguity and vagueness, while Hodge believed in clarity and precision in theological expression.[20] Hodge maintained that 'dogmatic statements' should be 'clear and explicit.' 'Definitions and distinctions,' he insisted, 'should be precise and above danger of mistake.' 'The whole tendency of German theology' has been just the opposite, he claimed. 'Dimness and generality have succeeded to precision and unequivocal enunciation.'[21]

Ambiguity and imprecision were not the only problems raised by Hodge. He gave this assessment of Schleiermacher's theological system: 'It is a philosophical theory and nothing more.'[22] His theology according

---

W. Andrew Hoffecker, *Charles Hodge: The Pride of Princeton* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2011), p. 314, notes that Hodge used Turretin's theology as a text in his teaching at Princeton Theological Seminary; Mark Rogers, 'Charles Hodge and the Doctrine of Accommodation', *Trinity Journal*, 31 no. 2 (2010), 231.

18 Hoffecker, *Charles Hodge*, p. 88, describes Tholuck as 'young, gifted, and, perhaps most significant, orthodox in his theology and pious in his manner of life'; W. Andrew Hoffecker, 'The Devotional Life of Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, and Benjamin B. Warfield', *Westminster Theological Journal*, 42 (1979), 116–124.

19 Hodge, *The Life of Charles Hodge*, p. 123.

20 *The Princeton Theology: 1812–1921*, ed. by Mark A. Noll (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1983), p. 14.

21 Charles Hodge, 'The Virtues of Seventeenth-Century Theologians', in *The Princeton Theology: 1812–1921*, ed. by Mark A. Noll (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1983), p. 115.

22 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 444.

to Hodge was merely a reflection of contemporary German philosophy.[23] 'His system,' contended Hodge, 'is a matter of speculation from beginning to end.' He added, 'It could never have existed except as a product of a mind imbued with the principles of German philosophy. It has no coherence, no force, and indeed no meaning.'[24] Because Schleiermacher's theology was nothing but a 'philosophical theory,' Hodge could describe it as 'wood, hay, and stubble.'[25]

These then are the problems, in general, which Hodge discerned in Schleiermacher's teaching. It lacked precision and clarity, and it was merely speculative philosophy. How did Hodge, though, respond to some of Schleiermacher's specific philosophical ideas and methodological procedures? This essay will examine Schleiermacher's teaching on revelation and inspiration, along with the polemical response of Charles Hodge, even while recognizing that Hodge came to the view that Schleiermacher may well have been a saved man, a true believer in Jesus Christ.

REVELATION: INTUITING THE THINGS OF GOD

Schleiermacher's position on revelation first appeared in *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers* (1799). Later, it developed further in *The Christian Faith* (1831). Both works have essentially the same doctrine of revelation.[26] Because his teaching on revelation is directly related to his conception of the nature of religion, we must first consider his thinking regarding religion.

---

[23] Gerrish, *Tradition and the Modern World*, pp. 46–47, points out that Schleiermacher himself acknowledged that 'the prevailing philosophical system' of a particular period of church history ought to provide the 'conceptual framework,' or 'the form of doctrinal expression.'

[24] Reardon, *Religion in the Age of Romanticism*, p. 55, sees Schleiermacher as being an exponent of Romantic philosophy. Reardon's analysis is certainly correct, but we need to keep in mind the philosophical influence of the Enlightenment in his work. Schleiermacher was, after all, committed to biblical higher criticism: Henry A. Kennedy, 'The Eschatology of Friedrich Schleiermacher', *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, 36 no. 2 (1994), 22; Colin Brown, *Miracles and the Critical Mind* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1984), p. 116.

[25] Charles Hodge, 'Religious State of Germany', *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 18 (October 1846), 530.

[26] Martin H. Prozesky, 'The Young Schleiermacher: Advocating Religion to an Age of Critical Reason (1768–1807)', *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 37 (December 1981), 69; Reardon, *Religion in the Age of Romanticism*, p. 31; Clements, *Friedrich Schleiermacher*, p. 25.

It was Schleiermacher's announced intention in his treatise *On Religion* to 'bear witness to' the nature of religion.[27] Religion in his view must not be confused with doctrine or with morality. According to Schleiermacher, 'the nature of the gods and their will' are 'only the extraneous parts' of religion.[28] 'Religion's essence' is 'intuition and feeling,' he contended. Intuition, in particular, is 'immediate perception.'[29] Intuition occurs 'when a religious view has become clear' to a person.[30] Intuition is 'the power and knack of absorbing everywhere the original light of the universe into our senses.'[31] The object of our intuition is the universe.[32] Intuition can take place when there are opportunities for 'quiet, submissive contemplation.'[33] Priests, in particular, should 'seek the universe and search out its expression.'[34]

The contrast between *On Religion* and *The Christian Faith* is, at this point, quite interesting. In the 1799 treatise, the emphasis is upon the communication of the universe. 'The universe,' he said, 'reveals itself to us every moment.'[35] In 1831, Schleiermacher was more ready to speak about a revelation coming from God. Revelation, he stated, 'presupposes a divine communication.'[36] There are, though, very few references to God in *On Religion*. Schleiermacher, in fact, made some startling statements. He asserted, for example, 'God is not everything in religion, but one, and the universe is more.'[37] He did speak, though, about 'everything visible' being 'formed and permeated by divinity.'[38] He referred to 'the divine life and activity of the universe.'[39] Hodge took the position that Schleiermacher embraced pantheism.[40] 'The system is essentially pantheistic,' he wrote. 'He denied any proper dualism between God and the world, and between

---

27 Schleiermacher, *On Religion*, p. 9.
28 Ibid., p. 21.
29 Ibid., p. 26.
30 Ibid., p. 73.
31 Ibid., p. 57.
32 Ibid., p. 49.
33 Ibid., p. 60.
34 Ibid., p. 92.
35 Ibid., p. 25.
36 Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, ed. by H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928), p. 50.
37 Schleiermacher, *On Religion*, p. 54.
38 Ibid., p. 37.
39 Ibid., p. 53.
40 It may be more accurate to view Schleiermacher as being a panentheist; Hugh R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology: Schleiermacher to Barth* (London: Nisbet and Company, 1937), p. 52.

God and man.' 'He did not admit the existence of a personal, extramundane God.'[41]

When intuition occurs—a religious view thus becoming clear to the one who intuits—the phenomenon which has taken place is revelation. Schleiermacher identified 'every original and new intuition of the universe' as 'revelation.'[42] The ultimate basis of such revelation is that 'the universe […] reveals itself to us every moment.'[43] The word *revelation* 'presupposes a divine communication and declaration.' Thus, when a religious view becomes clear to an individual, the ultimate cause of such a phenomenon must be traced back to an action of the universe itself: 'All intuition proceeds from an influence of the intuited on the one who intuits, from an original and independent action of the former, which is then grasped, apprehended, and conceived by the latter according to one's nature.'[44]

For Schleiermacher, revelation does not consist in the disclosure of doctrines or propositions. He was unwilling to accept the position, as he explained it, that revelation 'operates upon man as a cognitive being.' 'For that would make the revelation,' he said, 'to be originally and essentially doctrine; and I do not believe that we can adopt that position.'[45] Revelation is far from being the revelation of doctrine according to Schleiermacher. Instead, revelation has to do with new and original ideas about God arising in the soul of the person who intuits: 'It becomes difficult to avoid a widened application of the idea, to the effect that every original ideal which arises in the soul, whether for an action or for a work of art, and which can neither be understood as an imitation nor satisfactorily explained by means of external stimuli and preceding mental states, may be regarded as revelation.'[46]

Hodge provided a brief summary of Schleiermacher's doctrine of revelation along with an assessment of it. He explained that for Schleiermacher 'revelation is not the communication of new truth to the understanding.'[47] 'According to this theory, revelation is merely the providential ordering of circumstances which awaken and exalt the religious feelings, and which thus enable the mind intuitively to apprehend the things of God.'[48] Hodge opposed Schleiermacher at this point not by finding fallacies or incon-

41 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 444.
42 Schleiermacher, *On Religion*, p. 49.
43 Ibid., p. 25.
44 Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, p. 50.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid., p. 51.
47 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I, 66.
48 Ibid., p. 177.

sistencies within his system, but by simply appealing to the biblical teaching which asserts that revelation entails objective doctrines. 'This theory,' stated Hodge, 'is inconsistent with the Scriptural doctrine of revelation.' He continued, 'According to the Bible, God presents truth objectively to the mind, whether by audible words, by visions, or by the immediate operations of his Spirit.'[49]

As we shall note shortly in our consideration of Schleiermacher's doctrine of inspiration, Schleiermacher did not accede to the divine authority of Scripture. Thus, such an appeal on the part of Hodge would be meaningless to Schleiermacher. Hodge, of course, recognized that this was the case. He, nevertheless, appealed to the Scripture as being authoritative, for this was the historical position of the Christian church. By rejecting biblical authority, it was Schleiermacher who was out of step with the universal practice of historic Christianity. Hodge wrote, 'To us the scriptures are the work of God, which we do not judge, but by which we are judged, whence we derive all our religious knowledge. They are at once the source and the rule of our faith.' Hodge then drew attention to the contrary view advocated by Schleiermacher: 'The authority which we, in common with the whole Christian church, ascribe to the word of God, he ascribed to "the Christian consciousness," "to the inward experience, which everyone formed for himself on what he found in Christianity."'[50]

Hodge penetrated in these statements to the essence of the distinction between historic Christianity and that of Schleiermacher. Historically, the Christian church regarded scriptural revelation as being authoritative. For Schleiermacher, one's own personal experience of intuition—and the clear religious view which accompanies it—is the real authority. It has been well said that with Schleiermacher, 'theology undergoes a radical transformation in its notion of theological authority.' 'For Schleiermacher the real locus of authority does lie in the religious experience.' 'All external […] authorities are finally of no account.'[51]

INSPIRATION: ACTING OUT OF RELIGIOUS FEELING

Religion in the view of Schleiermacher only included intuition and feeling, but it nevertheless would inevitably express itself in terms of actions on the part of the religious person.[52] Schleiermacher said of himself that it

---

49 Ibid.

50 Hodge, 'Religious State of Germany', 532.

51 James C. Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Vatican II* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1971), p. 110.

52 Schleiermacher, *On Religion*, pp. 26, 29–30.

was religion that 'guided' him 'into the active life.'[53] For Schleiermacher, inspiration had to do with the deeds and actions of the religious person—the individual who intuited the universe and who had deep religious feelings.

'What is inspiration?' Schleiermacher asked. Inspiration, he answered, concerns 'every free action.'[54] He argued that the person who has the religious experience of intuition will necessarily have feelings which accompany it. Such 'feelings,' he maintained, 'are supposed to possess us.' When we are possessed by these religious feelings, 'we should express, maintain, and portray them.'[55] The suitable vehicle of such expression and portrayal is 'every free action,' which is inspiration.[56]

Inspiration, for Schleiermacher, did not relate so much to Holy Scripture, but rather to the free actions of the person who is possessed by religious feelings. Rather than speaking about the 'God-inspired Bible,' Schleiermacher wanted to talk about 'God-inspired persons.'[57] Such persons are what Schleiermacher called *mediators*.[58] It may well be the case that Schleiermacher saw himself as being 'a divinely-sent mediator.'[59] A mediator, he maintained, is a person who possesses 'spiritual penetration drive, which strives for the infinite.'[60] Mediators are holy souls which are 'stirred by the universe.'[61] They produce 'visions,' 'prophecies,' 'holy works of art,' 'inspired speeches,'[62] 'new revelation,' and 'sublime thoughts.'[63] Their ministry is to the slumbering masses who are dead to religion: 'They bring deity closer to those who normally grasp only the finite and the trivial.'[64]

Schleiermacher was willing to admonish his readers, 'Aim your attention only at […] God-inspired persons.'[65] He was unwilling, however, to provide a similar exhortation with reference to adhering to the Bible. In fact, he looked down on those who tenaciously grasped the Scripture. He said to his friends in the Romantic movement, 'You are right to despise the

53 Ibid., p. 8.
54 Ibid., p. 49.
55 Ibid., p. 29.
56 Ibid., p. 49.
57 Ibid., p. 15.
58 Ibid., p. 7.
59 Prozesky, 'The Young Schleiermacher', 64.
60 Schleiermacher, *On Religion*, p. 6.
61 Ibid., p. 14.
62 Ibid., p. 7.
63 Ibid., p. 14.
64 Ibid., p. 7.
65 Ibid., p. 15.

paltry imitators' who 'cling to a dead document.'[66] In a statement which necessarily included the Scriptures of the Christian church, he declared, 'Every holy writing is merely a mausoleum of religion, a monument that a great spirit was there that no longer exists; for if it still lived and were active, why would it attach such great importance to the dead letter?'[67]

The Bible according to Schleiermacher is not necessary. He asserted, 'It is not the person who believes in a holy writing who has religion, but only the one who needs none and probably could make one for himself.'[68] Such views were not merely the excesses of youth. Near the end of his life, he maintained that parts of the Old Testament were questionable as to whether or not they were Christian, and further that the Old Testament was not really needed anyway. 'Everyone must admit that if a doctrine had neither direct nor indirect attestation in the New Testament, but only in the Old,' wrote Schleiermacher, 'no one could have much confidence in regarding it as a genuinely Christian doctrine.' He then continued, 'Whereas if a doctrine is attested by the New Testament, no one will object to it, because there is nothing about it in the Old.' He then concluded, 'Hence the Old Testament appears simply a superfluous authority for Dogmatics.'[69]

Charles Hodge recognized that Schleiermacher denied biblical infallibility and inerrancy. In Schleiermacher 'inspiration is not the divine influence which controls the mental operations and utterances of its subject, so as to render him infallible in the communication of the truth revealed.'[70] It is true that Schleiermacher asserted that the person who is possessed by religious feelings freely acts in producing 'prophecies' and 'inspired speeches.'[71] But this is far from Hodge's doctrine that the Holy Spirit so guided 'the mental operations of a man so that he' would actually 'write without error and still be perfectly self-controlled and free.'[72]

The perspective which Schleiermacher maintained with reference to the Bible was well-summarized by Hodge: 'The Bible,' for Schleiermacher, 'contains only the thoughts of holy men; the forms in which their understandings without supernatural aid, clothed the 'intuitions' due to their religious feelings.'[73] Because the Bible is merely a human book, and

66 Ibid., p. 50.
67 Ibid.
68 Ibid.
69 Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, p. 115.
70 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I, 66.
71 Schleiermacher, *On Religion*, p. 7.
72 Charles Hodge, 'Inspiration', in *The Princeton Theology: 1812–1921*, ed. by Mark A. Noll (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1983), p. 138.
73 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I, 177.

not given by divine inspiration, it does not have binding authority upon Christians today. Hodge wrote, 'According to this theory the Bible has no normal authority as a rule of faith.'[74] Speaking about the issue of apostolic authority, Hodge asserted, 'He denies that the interpretation which they gave of their experience has normal authority for us, that is, he says that we are not bound to believe what the Apostle believed.'[75]

The Bible for Schleiermacher was not inspired, and therefore it did not have authority 'as a rule of faith.'[76] Hodge, moreover, perceived that there is another implication flowing out of the conception that the Bible is not given by divine inspiration. A book created merely by human beings must necessarily have error in it. Hodge affirmed, 'The Bible was to him […] by no means free from serious faults; the Old Testament being essentially on a level with the productions of heathenism; and the New, in its most important parts, mixed with fables (Myths), and even with errors in doctrine.'[77]

For Schleiermacher, as summarized by Hodge, the Scripture lacked the classical attributes of inspiration, divine authority, and infallibility. Hodge recognized, though, that the Bible had some value in Schleiermacher's thinking: 'The Bible was to him a mere human book, of great authority indeed, because in it are to be found the original expressions of Christian feeling.'[78] Indeed, Schleiermacher had made this point in his book *On Religion*. In speaking about 'the sources and original documents of religion,' he admitted that religion in a sense it to be found in them, but one must know 'how to read between the lines.'[79] For Schleiermacher, as Hodge put it, 'the Scriptures' are 'of value only as a means of awakening in us the religious life experienced by the Apostles, and thus enabling us to attain intuitions of divine things.'[80]

A HARMFUL THEOLOGY COMING FROM A BELIEVING HEART

We have seen in the previous discussion that Hodge had major problems with the 'philosophical theory' propounded by Schleiermacher.[81] He regarded it as nothing more than 'wood, hay, and stubble.'[82] His initial

74 Ibid.
75 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 443.
76 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I, 66.
77 Hodge, 'Religious State of Germany', 532.
78 Ibid.
79 Schleiermacher, *On Religion*, p. 22.
80 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I, 66.
81 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 444.
82 Hodge, 'Religious State of Germany', 530.

impression of *The Christian Faith* was that it seemed 'to darken counsel by words without wisdom.'[83] This view appears to have remained constant throughout his life.[84]

Hodge realized, however, that Schleiermacher's influence was enormous. He referred to Schleiermacher's theology in the context of a discussion about mysticism. 'If it consists in giving predominant authority to the feelings in matters of religion,' said Hodge, 'then Schleiermacher's system' is 'the most elaborate system of theology ever presented to the Church.'[85] Hodge further stated, 'Schleiermacher is regarded as the most interesting as well as the most influential theologian of modern times.'[86] He acknowledged that many people had nothing but 'grateful admiration' for Schleiermacher and that he had been 'held up' as the 'Church Father' of the nineteenth century. Hodge, though, took a very different position. 'Inexperienced young men,' he said, 'have been led to read his writings without suspicion and have thus been made skeptical or unbelieving as to many important doctrines.'[87]

Hodge provided an interesting explanation as to why Schleiermacher attempted to build a theology upon religious experience, rather than the Bible. It was Hodge's position that Schleiermacher's own faith in the Bible as a divine revelation, which was authoritative and inerrant, had been undermined by the higher criticism of his time. Schleiermacher therefore sought a new foundation for Christian theology, the foundation of religious feeling which could never be undermined by the higher critics. Hodge asserted, 'He succumbed to the attacks which rationalistic criticism had made against faith in the Bible. He could not receive it as a supernatural revelation from God.' What then Schleiermacher proceed to do? 'Deprived of the ordinary historical basis for faith in Christ, he determined to construct' a 'whole system of Christian theology from within; to weave it out of the materials furnished by his own religious consciousness.' The end result in the thinking of Schleiermacher was that he thought that he had produced an unassailable theology: 'He said to the Rationalists that they might expunge what they pleased from the evangelical records; they might demolish the whole edifice of Church theology, he had a Christ and a Christianity in his own bosom.'[88]

---

83 Hodge, *The Life of Charles Hodge*, p. 123.

84 Brian A. Gerrish, *A Prince of the Church: Schleiermacher and the Beginnings of Modern Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), pp. 17–19.

85 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I, 65.

86 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 440.

87 Hodge, 'Religious State of Germany', 539.

88 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 441.

What position did Hodge take regarding the spiritual standing of someone who denied the divine inspiration of the Bible? His general position was that true faith in Christ included a belief in the inspiration of Scripture.[89] Accepting the Scripture as the inspired Word of God was vitally important for Hodge: 'Faith therefore in Christ involves faith in the Scriptures as the word of God, and faith in the Scriptures as the word of God is faith in their plenary inspiration.' There will be 'the persuasion,' Hodge argued, 'that they are not the product of the fallible intellect of man but of the infallible intellect of God.' 'This faith' rested upon 'a supernatural illumination imparting spiritual discernment.'[90]

What did Hodge think about the spiritual standing of Schleiermacher before God? Against this background of Hodge's negative evaluation of Schleiermacher's theology, it is fascinating, and somewhat surprising, to consider Hodge's assessment of Schleiermacher the man. Early on, Hodge spoke hopefully about Schleiermacher's eternal welfare; at a later stage in his career, Hodge expressed confidence about his salvation. In 1851, less than a generation after Schleiermacher died, Hodge wrote, 'He was educated as a Moravian, but became addicted to a Pantheistic form of philosophy.' 'Yet, he often relapsed into his former faith, and thought, felt, acted, and *it is hoped*, died as a Moravian.'[91] In 1854, Hodge expressed more optimism concerning Schleiermacher's spiritual condition: 'We hope and believe that Schleiermacher became a theist and a Christian before his death.'[92]

The aged Hodge in his *Systematic Theology*, which appeared in 1872–1873, showed the most confidence regarding Schleiermacher's everlasting condition. He strongly suggested that he was a saved man. As Hodge recalled his student days in Germany, he said, 'When in Berlin the writer often attended Schleiermacher's church.' 'The hymns to be sung' were 'always evangelical and spiritual in an eminent degree, filled with praise and gratitude to our Redeemer.' Hodge then relayed the testimony of August Tholuck, professor of theology at Halle. 'Tholuck said that Schleiermacher, when sitting in the evening with his family, would often say, "Hush, children; let us sing a hymn of praise to Christ."' Hodge then raised this question: 'Can we doubt that he is singing those praises now? To whomsoever Christ is God, St. John assures us, Christ is a Saviour.'[93]

89 Hodge, 'Inspiration', 660.

90 Ibid., p. 661.

91 Charles Hodge, 'Professor Park and the Princeton Review', *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 23 (October 1851), 692.

92 Charles Hodge, 'Dr. Schaff's Apostolic Church', *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, 26 (January 1854), 170.

93 Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 440.

He concluded, 'Whatever may be true of his mere speculative system, he unquestionably in his heart regarded Christ as infinitely exalted above other men, and as the proper object of adoration and trust.'[94]

How can it be that Hodge had such a positive view of Schleiermacher *the man*, while at the same time he continually called attention to the danger of Schleiermacher *the theologian*? Is there not a continuity between the inward condition of the heart and the outward confession of faith? Does not a problem in one area entail a problem in the other? Hodge took the position that generally speaking there is continuity between the heart and the mind, the inward spiritual state and the outward expression of faith. 'As a general rule,' stated Hodge, 'a man's faith is the expression of his inward life.'[95] Schleiermacher, though, in Hodge's view reflected dissonance between his theological reflections and his inward life, making him 'an exceptionable case.'[96]

There was an explanation according to Hodge for the uniqueness of Schleiermacher. He had been forever impacted by his early education and his exposure to the gospel and the pietism of the Moravian brethren. Furthermore, Hodge cautioned about drawing inordinate conclusions about the heart of a man on the basis of his theological assertions. Hodge explained it this way: 'It should be remembered' that 'the inward life of a theologian may not be determined by his speculative doctrines.' He continued, 'This does not render error objectionable or less dangerous. It is nevertheless a fact, and enables us to condemn a system without wounding our charity for its author.'[97]

If Hodge is correct in his total assessment, then Schleiermacher illustrates the phenomenon of a liberal theology and a believing heart.

94 Ibid., p. 452.
95 Ibid., p. 443.
96 Ibid., p. 443.
97 Ibid., pp. 442–43.

Networks of Metaphors in the Hebrew Bible. Edited by Danilo Verde and Antje Labahn. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 309). Leuven: Peeters, 2020. ISBN: 978-90-429-4210-3. x + 395pp. €85.

Research units dedicated to biblical metaphor have been running at the annual European Association of Biblical Studies (EABS) and Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) conferences for the past two decades now. The present volume, based in great part on the EABS meeting in Helskinki, 2018, is the third output of these units to be published in the BETS series (following *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*, 2005, and *Metaphors in the Psalms*, 2010), and is dedicated to exploring 'the relationship and interplay between different metaphors in the texts of the Hebrew Bible' (p. 2). The 21 papers are organized according to the tripartite division of the Hebrew Scriptures, with a strong weighting in favour of the Writings, and are prefaced with a helpful introduction by Danilo Verde which orients the reader to the book. The volume, along with its predecessors, is an excellent representation of the contemporary state of research on biblical metaphor, illustrating the range of approaches current in the field.

The contributions in this volume approach the theme of 'networks of metaphors' from two different perspectives: some consider the complex interplay of metaphors within a specific passage, such as the Song of the Sea (Verde, pp. 13-30) or Psalm 51 (Van Wolde, pp. 193-214); while others are oriented around the extended use of metaphors of a certain type, such as nature imagery in Ezekiel (Rom-Shiloni, 93-110) or the varying significance of bird metaphors in the Wisdom Literature (Dell, pp. 245-62). Since it is not possible to comment here on each paper, the three selected summaries below are intended as representative of the range of contributions on offer.

Ryan P. Bonfiglio ('The Lord of Hosts Cares for His Flock', pp. 139-56) takes up one of the best-known biblical metaphors, that of the shepherd, considering the way in which Second Zechariah utilizes this single source domain (shepherding) to describe both the wicked and righteous leaders of Israel. Bonfiglio offers the valuable insight that by choosing not to activate certain elements of a source domain, an author is able to significantly affect the way the target domain (leadership) is understood – that is, Zechariah can create a picture of an 'anti-shepherd' through selectively utilising or altering certain common aspects of the source domain (a broken staff, the scattering of the flock, and so forth), showing the deficiency and failure of Israel's human leaders. By contrast, the metaphor of YHWH as shepherd is richly combined with warrior-king imagery, something Bonfiglio considers not a mixed metaphor, but a 'meta-metaphor',

one which blends congruous source domains (king, warrior, shepherd) to create a multi-faceted picture of God's rule.

In 'Metaphors of Space and Time' (pp. 215-32), Susanne Gilmayr-Bucher considers the way in which the psalmists of the fourth book of the Psalter use spatial and temporal metaphors to draw a picture of the stability and superiority of God's own dwelling place and eternal reign. She subsequently argues that this engenders his ability to construct a stable, safe, and ordered environment for his people, both on earth and, beyond that, in the divine space which is God himself as his people's refuge. The author demonstrates compellingly how the multiplication of metaphors across numerous psalms serves to construct a 'Thirdspace' in which God's people can live as they are intended to, and in which they can rejoice.

Pierre Van Hecke ('A Play on Plants', pp. 299-312) investigates the metaphorical networks in Job 12-14, focussing particularly on metaphors from nature and the way their interaction expresses Job's view, in this speech, of the hopelessness of humanity. A particularly rich aspect of this paper is the demonstration of how Job's speech picks up on source domains (the concepts drawn on to create the metaphor) used elsewhere in the book of Job, but often in juxtaposing ways – in particular, certain metaphors, such as that of the withering flower or the uprooted tree, are employed by Job's friends to express the fate of the wicked, but by Job to describe the fate of all humankind, reflecting Job's argument about the suffering of the innocent.

This volume is a valuable resource for anyone wishing to explore the breadth of contemporary research on biblical metaphor and gain an introduction to this rapidly growing field. Individual contributions will also be sought out by those studying the particular passages discussed. Overall, the volume may be considered a worthy successor to *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* and *Metaphors in the Psalms*.

Marilyn Burton, Edinburgh

Clash of Visions: Populism and Elitism in New Testament Theology. By Robert Yarbrough. Fearn: Mentor, 2019. ISBN: 9781527103917. 128 pp. £11.99.

Clash of Visions examines the worldview conflict between confessional Christianity ('populism') and the non-believing theological academy ('elitism'). According to Yarbrough, the one group seeks to understand, benefit, spread, and defend the Bible; the other focuses on reinterpreting it through a sceptical lens (p. 40). This book would be helpful for the theology student or pastor seeking a concise perspective on the reasons

for and results of the vast conceptual gap between much of religious academia and traditional faith.

Chapters one to three provide the main argument and two appendices report testimonials of populist academics' personal faith. In chapter one, Yarbrough explores the tension between elitists and populists. While most Christians take Scripture as the true word of God, elitists reflect a common set of sceptical traits: anti-miracle, anti-resurrection, anti-atonement, a view of Jesus as ethical teacher, and the belief that church is not necessary for the Christian (p. 26). While elitists are influential in shaping theological education but serve a diminishing ecclesial constituency, populist Christians, ranging 'from illiterate to highly trained' represent a continually growing movement comprising hundreds of millions of people (p. 25). Furthermore, while elitists encourage a wide range of hermeneutical approaches to Scripture, yet, because their starting point is anti-confessional and anti-supernatural, the traditional reading of Scripture is the one hermeneutic they have deemed untenable (not on historical grounds but *a priori*). As a case study, Yarbrough discusses a written debate in the 2017 Swedish Exegetical Annual between an elitist and a confessional scholar. His analysis of their exchange is insightful: both scholars rely on what is essentially a revelatory authority. For the one, it is Scripture; for the other, 'certain truths of criticism' (p. 37).

Chapter two examines the reboot of the interpretive methods of F C Baur and Rudolf Bultmann in current scholarship. Though Baur's proposal that the idea of Christ, not the history, is all that matters, was rebutted by 19th century scholars, his work is receiving a fresh reading. Baur's heir, Bultmann, rejected historic Christianity and, says Yarbrough, had a huge effect on harming the faith of seminarians in Germany (p. 57). Bultmann, too, is receiving new attention, including a book favourably discussing his theology written by a Southern Baptist seminary dean. Yarbrough observes that, despite the fact that the writings of both Baur and Bultmann have been adequately critiqued, their ideas continue to have traction in academia.

In Chapter three, Yarbrough explains that the difference between elitists and populists is an issue because of the enormous educational and cultural influence elitist interpreters exert. However, the two camps are so far apart that rapprochement is not possible. Instead, he sees potential for the growing populist worldwide church to take back ground in shaping hermeneutics. He gives several reasons, including populists' 'continued and increasing scholarly engagement', and the 'tenacity of populist convictions even unto death', which shows that rapprochement is not even relevant: they are going to live for Jesus whatever the elitists say (pp. 65-72).

In *Clash of Visions*, Yarbrough helpfully lifts the bonnet of the elitist car and shows what's under it: an anti-confessional, anti-supernatural viewpoint mediated by an 'elitist guild consensus functioning like the papal magisterium' (p. 37). He demonstrates that this elitist position is not, as it purports to be, objective. Rather, it relies on presuppositions which are contradictory not only to Scripture's own terms of engagement, but also to the experience of millions of Christians, and which, arguably, do not do justice to the historical evidence for the Biblical narrative.

Yarbrough's assessment that there is no real space for agreement between these camps may be both controversial and depressing, but is, I think, realistic. However, along with this incisive analysis of the chasm separating these worlds, I would have liked to see something about the intellectual and spiritual journey of an elitist turned populist, such as Thomas Oden: what is it that can bring about that change? The appendices, while interesting, are not essential to the substance of the book. The first, while containing a heartfelt testimony, seems rather tangentially related to the book's theme; the second, an interview, repeats but does not significantly expand on the themes of the book.

For pastors and evangelists needing to explain to laypeople and unbelievers why some academic theologians differ so widely from confessing Christians, this book provides helpful summaries, bullet points, and examples. For theology students newly encountering Baur or Bultmann, this book clarifies that though they may be lauded, their work has been critically assessed and found wanting. For populist theological educators, this book gives a neat summary of the wider theological world students face and a reminder of how important it is that they model rigorous thinking alongside a vibrant faith as they train the next generation.

David Mitchell, Connect Church, Kirkcaldy

Evil in Genesis: A Contextual Analysis of Hebrew Lexemes for Evil in the Book of Genesis. By Ingrid Faro. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2021. ISBN: 9781683594512. xxi + 279pp. £29.99.

In this book we find Ingrid Faro's doctoral work on evil in Genesis. From the outset – if the title did not give it away – this should indicate something of the complexity of the work. This work is a welcome sight, demonstrating how ongoing lexical work holds an important place in the work of exegesis and theological study. While the work is quite complex, Faro has done a remarkable job at making it accessible to people with less technical knowledge. Therefore, the book may be profitably read by a wider audience than may first seem apparent (although it may be difficult to approach without a fair knowledge of Biblical Hebrew).

Faro begins with her Introduction and then splits her analysis into three major sections. In the introduction, she outlines previous discussion on evil in Genesis, reviews related literature, and then outlines her methodological approach. As she outlines her methodology, we get a brief history of linguistic application to biblical studies and find that various methodological approaches fed into her work.

This leads us into Part I. This section is made up of Faro's lexical work. In this section, Faro first analyses occurrences of the word family רעע which includes a verb, noun, and adjective. (It is the adjective of this word family which is used in the phrase 'the tree of the knowledge of good and evil'.) This analysis looks at the distribution of the words in both narrative and direct discourse and their relation to speech acts. She structures her chapter by moving sequentially through the major sections (*toledot*) of Genesis. This chapter highlights the structure of the 'plot conflict of good and evil' (p. 62) which is found in Genesis. In the second chapter, Faro examines the semantic field and range of meaning of the word family. Essentially, this involves looking at words which co-occur with or seem to be similar in meaning to the word family she is studying. This leads to a fairly standard set of definitions for the terms and identification of a series of features related to its use. She highlights the relationships with *good* and *sight* for special attention.

Part II builds on this work to analyse relationships between *sight*, *good*, and *evil* in Genesis. Again, she does this sequentially, following the major sections of Genesis. This leads to a partially lexical (about the word) and partially conceptual/theological definition of *evil* as 'a hypernym, a major category word, under which everything bad is subsumed [lexical]. Most simply defined, evil is anything and everything that departs from God and his ways as established in creation [conceptual/theological]' (p. 131).

Finally, Part III, applies this work to develop conceptual and theological observations and implications. This follows the same sequential procedure as before, but looks at the concept of evil as it is seen in Genesis from a theological perspective. This leads to an interesting set of conclusions, one of which is that:

> In Genesis, evil is predominantly the result of God allowing the world of humans with evil intentions to continue and bring about the consequences due to the prevalence of human and nonhuman agents choosing evil, contrary to God and his ways. Creation with a broad swath of free reign has the legal right to decide against God, and therefore, to corrupt and twist what is intended for good into various shades of evil (p. 191).

Following her conclusion, Faro has three helpful excurses. These provide some short and intriguing developments on some themes noted in the body of the text. They may be adequately identified by their titles: 'Good versus evil desire in Genesis 2-3 and the tenth commandment'; 'When God takes human life: corruption, evil, and death'; and 'A word about theology, ideology, and the tree of knowledge: in defense of blending academia and faith'. The book then ends with an appendix listing 'All occurrences of evil רע, רעה, רעע in Genesis BHS MT compared with Rahlf's LXX and NASB English translation'.

I was pleased to see in this work a concerted effort to apply a study of words and their meanings to the task of theology in what seems to be a more appropriate way than has been done in the past. The major value of this work is, I believe, in that procedure being detailed and also in the more conceptual and theological portions. Unfortunately, due to the small sample of text, any conclusions of the meaning of words are rather general and unlikely to receive the nuance that may be seen in a more thorough study. Thankfully, (here I write as one who has studied the adjective and noun across the entire Ancient Hebrew literature for my doctoral dissertation) it does not appear to let down her development of themes in any critical way. Other than that, my only quibbles would be that Faro treats the word family as though it were one word (which thankfully turns out to not be a massive problem for these particular words), and a small amount of relevant literature on lexical work was missed.

I would recommend this book primarily for academics and people with academic training in biblical studies who are interested in the process of theology. It will be of particular interest to those wanting to know how the study of words can work its way through to theology.

Philip D. Foster, Edinburgh

Devoted to God's Church: Core Values for Christian Fellowship. By Sinclair B. Ferguson. Edinburgh, UK: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2020. ISBN: 978-1-84871-976-7. xii + 187pp. £6.50.

One of the great privileges of being a believer is not only knowing and being *in Christ*, but also knowing and belonging *to God's people* (p. 187). This is the heart of Sinclair Ferguson and the impetus for this inspiring work that offers essential biblical doctrine related to the church. Ferguson outlines this doctrine with clarity, supplying principles and practices for all who belong to God's family. If you are searching for a new-members book or are thinking about church membership – this book will prove beneficial. The core values for disciples are universal regardless of church size, location or moment in history. Ferguson covers areas pertinent to

church life as a skilled theologian, a compassionate pastor, and a fellow church member.

Devoted to God's Church is not only *Ecclesiology 101* but is also highly personal in that it highlights the meaning of belonging to a local church, worshipping, serving and reaching the world. Chapter emphases include: 1) *What Is a Church*, 2) *Are You a Christian*, 3) *Being a Disciple*, 4) *What is a Member*, 5) *Worship*, 6) *The Bible*, 7) *Christian Baptism*, 8) *Prayer*, 9) *Christian Service*, 10) *Communion*, and 11) *Christian Witness and World Mission*. Eleven weighty chapters well worth the investment, and two of which I briefly highlight below.

While people seek to analyse and assess worship, Ferguson, in Chapter 5, rightly determines that God alone is capable and worthy to assess the quality of our worship. To prove this, he turns to the prophet's vision in Isaiah 6, where he examines 1) the glory of God, 2) the sovereignty of God, 3) the holiness of God, 4) sensing and tasting pardon, and 5) the sermon. He sees Isaiah's 'Woe is me! For I am lost … (Isa. 6:5)' as significant, in that it is the seventh of seven 'Woes' that covers an assortment of sins and sinners (5:8, 11, 18, 20, 21, 22), Isaiah being the last offender. Ferguson's point for the church to grasp is that when our worship is genuine, we will never leave the service the same as we came, for the Lord will meet us, teach us, convict us, forgive us, and equip us.

As Ferguson explores the topic of Christian baptism (Chapter 7), he highlights that often believers place too little value on baptism and especially its long-term effects on their lives. Drawing from Luther's *Baptizatus sum* ('I am a baptized man!') Ferguson encourages us to 'live a baptized life' (p. 112). Luther was reminding himself of who *he was* in Christ and as such, every believer should view their baptism as a daily reminder of who *they are* in Christ. Failure to do so reveals an insufficient view of baptism. After setting forth baptism's importance there are discussions on 1) What baptism is, and 2) What baptism means. In the first section he finds that baptism is a naming ceremony – our baptism is into the *Name*. Like receiving a name at birth, baptism does not change anything *within us*, but baptism, like our name has a lifelong impact *on us* (p. 104). In the second section Ferguson explores what it means to truly be *in Christ* using Colossians 2:11-15 as his lens. He strikingly concludes that Jesus' baptism was also a naming ceremony for there, the Father publicly identified him as the Son of God (Luke 3:21-23; Ps. 2:7; Isa. 42:1).

Ferguson's work points to his deep love for the church. If our Lord loved and died for the church, Ferguson believes Jesus' disciples should love the church as well, and this should involve belonging to and actively serving in a local church. The work also points to Ferguson's prophetic

voice about the church, for he asserts that if one wants to be a member serving incognito, then they should rethink being a member (p. 13).

Ferguson's *devoted* ecclesiology is not like other 'church expert' books, touting their success, for he knows that a life that is God-centred, Christ-centred, and Spirit-centred must be a life that is also church-centred (p. 4). He wants believers to understand the gravity of being a church member and how each one finds their place within the body of Christ. *Devoted to God's Church* will fit nicely on the shelf of every conscientious believer; a good companion for Ferguson's *Devoted to God: Blueprints for Sanctification* (Banner of Truth, 2016). Ferguson is not interested in 'church machinery', his desire is to be faithful as Jesus *builds his church* (Matt. 16:18). This book is for the church, but it is also for you as a part of Christ's church, for he, like Paul, wants us to 'know how people ought to conduct themselves in God's household, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of the truth' (1 Tim. 3:15).

Tony A. Rogers, Southside Baptist Church, Bowie, TX USA

Analog Church: why we need real people, places and things in the digital age. By Jay Y. Kim. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2020. ISBN 978-0-8308-4158-5. 192pp. £11.99 (8.35 Kindle).

Jay Kim is Pastor of teaching and leadership at Vintage Faith church in Santa Cruz, and co-leads the ReGeneration Project, offering theology and church for new generations. *Analog Church* distils his concerns about the digital directions churches are moving in.

Critiquing the US church's 'red-hot pursuit of relevance' when people are longing for transcendence (p. 7), Kim presents his concerns in three sections as key to authentic, physical church life and mission: worship, community, and scripture.

He observes churches embracing a digital age that can make us impatient, shallow, and isolated. On our acts of 'worship', he sets out his key questions: 'When it comes to the singing life of our churches, we must ask… "Does this entertain or engage?"' On preaching, 'we must ask… "Are we asking people to watch or witness?"' (pp. 65-66). He explores the impact of darkened rooms and lighting, commending a nearby church which reverses the common practice: lights shine from behind the worship band, 'which generates a very particular mood and… communicates a very particular philosophy… that this experience isn't about the band up front but about us collectively encountering and responding to God together' (p. 63).

He notes a growing use of 'participatory liturgy' (p. 64) giving meaningful shape and direction to public worship and increasing involvement.

'Singing and creating music together has a strong positive effect on physical and emotional health… accelerating… relational connections. God made us to sing together' (p. 65).

He distinguishes between digital exchange of information, communicating, and exchanging presence, communing, which can only be achieved in analogue. Digital language is of commodity not community (p. 95). Yet he's alert to the subtleties, quoting Ed Stetzer: 'A church should be online, but I don't think it should be online church' (p. 97). Exploring ekklesia, 'What I am suggesting is that we understand and utilize online platforms for what they truly are – a helpful digital means to a greater incarnational end.'

On scripture, he compares the 'intermittent variable rewards' offered by digital's constant calls to check and see what's new; and the steady, complete, and in Larry Hurtado's words, 'bookish faith' Christianity offers. 'Until the last few hundred years, *reading the Bible* had primarily been a communal and extended act… these… long-format texts (were) meant to be heard either in their entirety or, at the very least, prolonged segments' (p. 138).

As he ends, his short and moving chapter on 'The Meal at the Center of History' touches on one of the most poignant dimensions of the pandemic. And he concludes with a final meditation on light, the light of the world.

Full of personal illustration and people's perspectives, Kim eloquently unpacks the reality of God in our physicality and our call to Christian community, demonstrating the overriding value of church 'in person.' Agreed; yet I have questions. The review copy came with a letter from IVP, their author interview, headed, 'How the Digital Age is Damaging the Church'. I wanted to check if this accurately reflected Kim's intention; cue a second interview, between me and Kim himself.

Kim's book critiques a US movement that has gone far further in distancing people from the 'real' than other settings have experienced. Published in 2020, it was written before the pandemic. We've been thinking that the pandemic changed everything, so I got in touch to ask what he would say differently at this stage.

Our brief exchange reflected different experiences in the US, the UK, and Middle East. While digital experience has its painful aspects, it has been *real* because it is built on analogue relationships and is expecting those to resume. We're not avatars on screen, but real people; we're not playing games but keeping in touch when not allowed to meet physically. As Professor Jason Leitch said early on, 'The church has played a blinder'. Our churches have refused to accept isolation and remade themselves to become accessible in every home. Some have made spectacular

gains during lockdowns, though now are having a tough time persuading people to come back to the premises.

Most of us accept that what we've learned this last two years has equipped us to continue to serve and meet in both analogue and digital fashion. We know the limitations keenly, yet we've learned to offer 'good enough' encounters. As we live with this bug, we've learned that church can morph and shape itself to encourage and equip one another and offer meaningful encounters with enquirers who also share our longing for physical encounter.

This is a great book, and I heartily recommend it. His next scheduled book is 'Analog Christian', due in 2022 (you'll get a flavour at https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/doubt-deconstruction-patient-faith/; some of his recent reflections are at https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/should-online-church-continue/ and on his blog https://jaykimthinks.com). I hope he's already writing another, 'Blended Church' perhaps.

Mike Parker, Edinburgh

Masada. By Jodi Magness. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019. ISBN: 978-0-691-16710-7. x + 265pp. £25.00.

'The fall of Masada' in AD73/74, in which '967 Jewish men, women, and children reportedly took their own lives rather than suffer enslavement or death at the hands of the Roman army' (p. 1), is one of the most dramatic stories in ancient history. In this recent book, Jodi Magness of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, examines the account in its wider context from multiple angles. The result is a fascinating series of discussions on a range of topics which form threads in the rich tapestry that is the story of Masada.

The first chapter provides a brief account of the events as they are generally understood, drawing on the writings of Josephus. Magness moves quickly into a description of the archaeological work carried out by Yigael Yadin. Then she moves on to discuss the contribution of Josephus, providing a brief biography and subjecting his complex life history to scrutiny. She argues that Josephus's writings have survived when many ancient texts did not because Christians preserved them with apologetic motives.

The second chapter tells the gripping story of the various explorers who were involved in the identification of the site, including the many hazards they faced. In chapter three, Magness describes Masada's 'natural setting' in the Judean desert, near the Dead Sea, and its 'historical setting' in the 'late Second Temple period'.

Chapter four is devoted to Herod the Great's building projects, of which the palace at Masada was only one. Chapter five takes a wider historical perspective on 'Judea before Herod'. This is a valuable survey of the Jewish people from settlement in Canaan through to the appointment of Herod as 'king of the Jews', with most space being devoted to the Maccabees, the various Jewish 'sects', and the Hasmoneans.

In chapter six, Magness discusses Herod's reign and its aftermath while, in chapter seven, she describes the first Jewish revolt against Rome. This latter chapter is particularly fascinating and horrifying. It sets the scene for the description of the rebel occupation of Masada in chapter eight. In this chapter, Magness discusses who the rebels of Masada actually were.

The final main chapter, entitled, dramatically, '"Masada Shall Not Fall Again": Yigael Yadin, the Mass Suicide, and the Masada Myth' is a powerful conclusion to the whole narrative.

As an experienced archaeologist as well as an ancient historian, Magness provides careful descriptions of the topography of the region and the modern excavation sites, along with a fascinating account of the events based on ancient sources. In fact, Magness's association with Masada goes back, as she explains in the acknowledgements, to when she 'worked as a field guide and naturalist in the Ein Gedi Field School in 1977–80' (p. ix). The epilogue to the book is a description of Magness's favoured tour of the archaeological remains. There are several colour photos and numerous black and white photos.

The book is also available as an audiobook and works remarkably well in that format as a result of Magness's clear and engaging writing and the excellent narration.

This is a fascinating book and an excellent example of rigorous scholarship presented clearly and attractively for a wide readership. I highly recommend it.

Alistair I. Wilson, Edinburgh Theological Seminary, Edinburgh

Essentially One: Striving for the Unity God Loves. By Jonathan Lamb. London: IVP, 2020. ISBN 978-1-78359-911-0. 220pp. £12.99 (eBook £8.99).

Books are pouring out of Jonathan Lamb, and we're very much in his debt. A regular Keswick speaker, he writes among others for IVP and Langham. A statesman among us, he brings a lifetime's experience and biblical reflection on local church life, UK and international student ministry, and coaching and training preachers and teachers…

In a world of walls and firewalls and relentless media coverage of division, there's no room for naivety. 'By contrast, at the heart of the Christian gospel is the story of reconciliation: walls dismantled, alienations healed, relationships restored, a new internationalism and a new society' (p. xvi). This is unpacked in four parts, each of the 16 chapters expounding and applying key biblical passages about the unity God intends for his people to display.

'Joining God's Mission' takes us through Acts 10, 11, and 15 to show God accepts all, Jesus is Lord of all, and salvation is available to all. Our part in maintaining the unity God has provided is very hard work yet well worth the effort (Eph. 4:1-6). It needs us to focus on Jesus' heart for unity in John 17, which as John Goldingay mused is 'the most spectacularly unanswered prayer in world history' (p. 37).

Hence part 2, Lamb's exploration of 'Difference and Diversity'. Acts 15 reveals rapid growth and sharp dispute, needing Al Mohler's memorable 'Theological Triage' (p. 56). What first, second, and third-order doctrines are involved? How are they balanced and applied? How do they bring and demonstrate Christian maturity? Romans 14-15 gives principles of solidarity, accountability, harmony, humility, and priority, which in J C Ryle's words enable us to 'keep the walls of separation as low as possible, and shake hands over them as often as you can' (p. 70). In Chapter 7, Romans 12 describes 'Christians Incorporated', belonging to one another, united against individualism, tribal interests and pride to focus on energetic, generous and prayerful unity.

Part 3 mines a number of passages to help with 'Confronting Challenges' and managing conflict. What often proves 'the greatest challenge for missionaries, actually getting on with fellow Christians' (p. 91), involves a mix of intense work, exhaustion and spiritual battle, and conflicts over teaching and strategy which may prove necessary. We learn to agree in Philippians, overcome barriers in Philemon, defend the truth in Galatians, discover productive change in Acts 6, and exercise discipline in 2 Peter 2 where false teaching brings distortion, deception, depravity, and destruction. The section ends with insight for those of us in mixed denominations on balancing gentle instruction with necessary discipline. 'Changing our attitudes and behaviour' is the final and longest part. John Stott lamented 'our pathological tendency to fragment'. Responses to disagreement range from a Phillipino, 'That's easy. We start a new church'; to 'Where there are 2 Serbs, you will get 3 opinions' (pp. 127-8). Philippians 1-2, Acts 16 and James 3 mean Lamb remains hopeful: 'We… know that handling disagreement well can… have a truly redemptive effect. It can become the occasion for personal and corporate growth and, ultimately, for the bonds of fellowship to be strengthened' (p. 128).

Chapter 12, 'Mind your language', struck me forcibly. Words are crucial because God chose to communicate primarily through them and 'the ministry of the Word in all its dimensions is vital for the health of the church. Speech is a test case because our lips reflect what is going on inside, for good or evil. What we say and how we say it is of serious concern now and in the light of future judgement' (p. 141). 'Weaponized words' intimidate and humiliate; 'Tribal words' belittle; 'Negative words' are quarrelsome and critical. Instead, we aim for 'Attentive words', bringing Proverbs 18:13 to bear (including a useful guide to emailing). By God's grace the result can be 'Transformative words'.

Lamb's last 4 chapters take us from Acts 2:42 through Galatians 3:26-29 and Philippians 1 to the ultimate vision of Revelation 7:9-12, our one hope, the big story we are called to play our part in. God's family serve God's gospel and focus God's glory because of God's purposes, Christ's cross, one another and the world. Finally, 'Let there be no doubt: the unity which he has won is secure, for he has declared: "I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"' (Matt. 16:18, p. 203).

This is a timely, bold book, the fruit of long reflection and biblical study. Individual readers, groups, and bible teachers will appreciate his thoughtful questions at the end of each chapter. Lamb's travels with networks like IFES, Lausanne, and Langham demonstrate and fuel his passion to help us deal with difference for unity's sake, to present and model the gospel. His sources and quotes mean this is primarily an in-house conversation among Evangelicals: a good place to start, addressing our fissiparous tendencies and endless differentiation, urging us to remain related especially when we move in different directions, appealing for common focus and purpose reflected in our variety and difference.

Mike Parker, Edinburgh

The State of New Testament Studies. Edited by Scot McKnight and Nijay K. Gupta. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2019. ISBN: 978-0-8010-9879-6. xiv + 496pp. £28.99.

McKnight and Gupta have gathered together a strong line-up of scholars to produce a volume of bibliographical essays which will serve teachers, students, and pastors well as they seek to keep abreast of recent developments in academic study of the New Testament.

As the editors indicate in their Introduction, this book is a successor to *The Face of New Testament Studies* (Baker, 2004). It is intended to perform the same function as the earlier work for a new generation. The basic structure of the two books is, thus, very similar (though not identical).

State has four main parts: Ancient Context; Interpretation; Jesus, Paul, and New Testament Theology; New Testament Texts.

Some essay titles are almost the same in both books and cover broadly the same topic. Other essays cover topics not addressed in the earlier volume, including Lynn Cohick's chapter on 'Women in the Jewish, Greco-Roman, and Early Christian World'.

Contributors were apparently permitted a measure of liberty in writing their respective chapters, so that the essays vary in approach, length, and the range of material covered. Given that the chapters are analytical bibliographical essays, they are not designed to offer ground-breaking research or theological illumination. However, they perform their intended task well: to provide a general orientation to the current state of research in the areas covered. Where there are contentious debates, the authors typically do not attempt to resolve the debates but simply provide details of works that represent the different positions. Many readers will probably dip into the book as required rather than read it from cover to cover.

The contributors reflect significantly greater diversity in terms of gender and ethnicity than the earlier volume, which is commendable, but the contributors all teach in 'Western' nations. I hope that a future revision might include more authors belonging to, and working in, the Majority World. Some authors point readers to scholarship produced by Majority World authors. It is hard to discern particular theological convictions in essays such as these. All authors treat the biblical texts with respect, but contributors seem to represent significantly different theological perspectives.

Of course, *State* was published only fifteen years after *Face*, so readers will still learn much from the older book. Theological libraries should have both volumes on their shelves, as should most teachers of New Testament studies. Theological students should certainly read through relevant chapters of this new book as they take courses on particular New Testament documents or as they construct bibliographies for assignments. Many preachers will find it a useful resource for keeping reasonably well-informed of current discussions and resources, although they will probably find that there is more detail than they usually need. One of the inevitable challenges that contributors to such a volume face is that their published work is outdated from the moment it is published. That does not diminish the value of such an important publication. Rather, it reminds teachers, students, and preachers of the need to be constantly working to retain currency, as far as possible, in their studies.

Alistair I. Wilson, Edinburgh Theological Seminary, Edinburgh

Can we Trust the Gospels? By Peter J. Williams. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018. ISBN 978-1-4335-5295-3. 153pp. £8.99.

This review was originally published online by Solas at https://www.solas-cpc.org/book-review-can-we-trust-the-gospelsby-peter-j-williams/. It is reproduced here with permission. Solas also conducted an interview with the author at https://www.solas-cpc.org/can-we-trust-the-gospels-in-conversation-with-peter-j-williams/.

In the preface to this short and accessible book, Pete Williams, warden of Tyndale House in Cambridge, states that his aim is to 'present a case for the reliability of the Gospels to those who are thinking about the subject for the first time'. Has he managed to do so? It would be a very short review simply to answer in the affirmative, but I want to do exactly that before saying a little more. I want to commend Williams' book and persuade you of its worth. Then I want to suggest who might be most helped by it.

The book proceeds through a number of arguments for the reliability of the Gospels, many of which will be familiar to anyone who has dipped their toe in these waters. The added value in this book is threefold. First, the issues are explained with a commendable clarity and simplicity. Secondly, it is obvious to any reader that there is a weight of scholarship behind every sentence in the book. Footnotes are kept to a minimum, but there are enough to give the reader confidence that Williams' arguments are based on careful (and lifelong) engagement with these issues at an academic level. Thirdly, there are a number of lines of evidence adduced in this book that will be new to many readers and reflect some more recent scholarly findings. For example, Williams draws upon Bauckham's work on the Gospels as eyewitness testimony and develops it further with his own work on naming conventions in 1st century Palestine and accuracy of geographical knowledge. For many, therefore, the chapter 'Did the Gospel writers know their stuff?' is on its own worth the cost of the book, containing much fascinating information and pointers towards further reading for those particularly interested.

The cumulative case presented is compelling. Williams is careful to point out that he is not trying to 'prove' the trustworthiness of the Gospels so much as trying to show that it is entirely rational to trust them as reliable accounts of Jesus' life and teaching. In this aim, I would certainly judge him successful. However, this leads to a last reflection on Williams' book. Who will benefit from it?

Is this the sort of book that could be given to an interested sceptic? Certainly – although I don't meet many interested sceptics who are asking the particular questions being answered by this book. Does that

mean that it's not a useful book? Far from it! It's just that we need to be clear that a book like this isn't designed to compel someone into the Kingdom by sheer force of logic and weight of evidence – Williams is careful to avoid such a modernist construal of faith. Rather, I suspect that this book is going to be most helpful in giving confidence to young Christians. It is essential reading for Christians who have (or are faced with) questions about the reliability and authority of the Gospels and need to know that their questions or doubts can be answered so that they can engage in conversation with their non-believing friends without the fear that somehow their faith will be shown to be in vain. It would be an excellent resource for, for example, undergraduate theology students.

In conclusion, then, this is a great little book and should form part of an armoury of resources that will give Christians greater confidence in the reasonableness of their faith. If it then causes those Christians both to live in line with the Gospels and to share more confidently and winsomely the Good News of their subject, then the job will be well done.

Mark Stirling, Chalmers Institute

British Gods: Religion in Modern Britain. By Steve Bruce. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. ISBN: 978-0-19-885411-1. V + 282pp. £22.50.

British Gods: Religion in Modern Britain, is essentially a tour guide's handbook on the condition and health of religion in the UK written by one of the leading international experts on religion and politics, Steve Bruce. Although Bruce considers the impact of the arrival of growing numbers Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs and Muslims from the 1960s in chapter 7 'Worktown and Muslims,' what he terms 'Gods of the Common People: Folk Religion and Superstition' in chapter 8 and 'Spiritualism, Spirituality, and Social Class' in chapter 9, the central focus of this book is on the decline of Christianity in the UK, the dominate state religion, since the 1851 Census of Religious Worship. Bruce makes the observation that 'the typical Briton has gone from churchgoing Christian, to nominal Christian, to non-Christian who nonetheless thinks religion (in the abstract at least) is a good thing, to being someone who supposes that religion does more harm than good' (p. 270). *British Gods* could be presented as a depressing read, especially for those who hope for a revival and a reversal of the overall decline in interest in Christianity. It is, however, an important book for evangelicals to read. It is a review of the state of Christianity in the UK as perceived by a professional sociologist looking at the social setting that the church now finds itself in, from a relatively disinterested perspective. The book is a crash-course in understanding how things are

perceived from a secular standpoint. It makes for uncomfortable, if necessary, reading.

Chapters 1-3 sketch out from a sociological perspective the various reasons why the UK was an overwhelmingly Christian country, in terms of verifiable religious observance (Church attendance and rites of passage), until the clearly observable secularisation of UK society in the second half of the twentieth century, continuing into the twenty-first century. The focus of the chapter is contained in the title: chapter 1, 'The Big House: Elite Patronage of Religion'; chapter 2, 'Ties that Bind: Community Cohesion in Scotland and Wales'; and chapter 3, 'Social Roles of the Clergy: Cumbria and Devon.' In chapter 4, 'Old Rivals Merge; New Divisions Emerge' Bruce maintains that the declining popularity of Christianity was the main driver for mergers of Church congregations in many social settings. He contends that the theological distinctions between main Christian denominations, so important historically, are unknown by the majority of people in a town and largely even among members of local congregations. In chapter 4 Bruce explores in 'New Divisions: Women Clergy, Worship, and Sexuality' how, in his opinion, the Church has taken the losing side on important social matters on each occasion, which in turn had the effect of furthering its loss of influence and popularity within society.

In chapter 5 'Modernizing the Faith: The Charismatic Movement' Bruce argues that instead of reversing secularization 'it actually facilitated decline by providing young members of conservative Christian families with a stepping stone on the road to religious indifference and by reducing the visible presence of Christianity' (p. 120). From a sociological perspective, the sources of initial growth were those who were already Christian. One historian, according to Bruce, estimated that 90 per cent of members were 'defectors from other churches' (p. 117). In chapter 6 'Migrant Christians and Pentecostalism in London' Bruce notes that London has seen a significant increase in church attendance. This increase, he maintains, is entirely due to the migrant background of newcomers into London who have arrived from more religious countries (p. 141).

In chapter 11, Bruce asks the question 'Can the Decline be Reversed?' While Bruce does not contend that a reversal of the secularization trend in the UK is impossible, he does explore the likely constraints to any revival. The first is the 'Declining Stock of Religious Knowledge' or simply ignorance of the basic elements of the Christian faith. Among the other constrains, according to Bruce, are: 'State Neutrality and the Loss of Ambient Religion'; 'The Public Reputation of Religion'; 'Social Influence in Religious Conversion'; 'Religion is now Alien'; and 'The Odds of Meeting a Believer'.

In conclusion, *British Gods* is a difficult but useful read for the pastor or minister interested in gaining a deeper understanding of the state of religion in the UK, at least from the perspective of a secular sociologist. Whilst bleak, one cannot begin to cure the patient if one does not first understand what ails them; so it is with the decline in religious participation and ambivalent attitudes of a largely secular society in the UK. Bruce's various confrontational statements are not easy to read but his study is an important reference point for evangelicals to consider.

Philip McCormack, Spurgeon's College and Aaron McCormack, London

The Meaning of Protestant Theology: Luther, Augustine, and the Gospel That Gives Us Christ. By Phillip Cary. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2019. ISBN: 9-78-080103945-4. 384pp. £22.99.

An engaging volume encompassing 12 substantial chapters, Cary explains that his motivation for writing comes in part from the growing number of Protestants who, enamoured with the sacramental richness of Roman Catholicism or Eastern Orthodoxy, increasingly see little reason to remain part of their tradition. While this 'is a question', he writes, 'that often arises for Protestants having their first robust encounter with the Great Tradition of the church' (p. 1), the author contends that Protestantism does indeed boast a unique contribution to Christian theology that makes it worth holding to: The conviction, as per Martin Luther, that the gospel is ultimately a sacramental word, God's giving of himself to us in the person of Christ.

Cary's work is divided into 3 parts. The first deals with Augustine's spirituality, which Luther's theology was initially shaped by yet eventually departed from. In addition to a sustained engagement with the patristic doctrine of God, Augustine's renowned Christian Platonism occupies an indispensable role in this portion of the volume. Cary, a philosopher by training, evaluates its strengths and weaknesses, contending its fatal flaw 'is that it moves in a different direction from the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ, which is a descent into flesh rather than an ascent of the Spirit' (p. 37). Cary is concerned, in other words, that the Church Father's understanding of the gospel 'makes Christ's humanity our way to God rather than God's way to us' (p. 75); rather than an external word apprehended by faith, it becomes a journey sustained by love.

This discussion lays the groundwork for Part II, which deals with the development of Luther's understanding of the gospel as the 'gracious word of God that gives us Christ' (p. 7). The young Luther, terrified by knowledge of his sin, resorted to what Cary calls spiritual masochism, even suggesting we should wish ourselves condemned. Far from loving

God as we should, Luther understood from 'Augustine's counterfactual test…that our supposed love of God is actually fear of punishment' (p. 125). Cary credits this realization for Luther's later insistence on separating law and gospel; his mature insistence on the gospel as an external word is 'thus', he suggests, 'a great comfort to those who know what it is like to be weak in faith' (p. 158). The answer for such a condition is not looking inward to see that one loves as they should, but trusting in the promise of God. Ironically, Cary points out that only this knowledge, that one is justified by faith alone, not by love, is the only way one can be free to truly love at all. 'In that way the Gospel', he writes, 'frees me to live in love, concerned for the good of my neighbour rather than wrapped up in my spiritual anxieties' (p. 204). Although Cary acknowledges that 'Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone amounts in the end to a doctrine of *salvation* by faith alone' (p. 113), many evangelicals might be surprised by Cary's assertion that, even for the mature Luther, justification remained a process rather than an instantaneous declaration, contrary to the understanding of later Lutherans. While some readers may contest this, the author's raising this issue is a caution to students of historical theology who might mistakenly conflate Reformation theology *per se* with later expressions of Protestantism.

The third part of Cary's volume reflects on the consequences of Luther's thought within the Protestant tradition, his sobering recognition of the reformer's inexcusable anti-Semitism demonstrating that Cary is not uncritical in his appraisal. He also cautions Protestants against demanding the kind of scientific certainty about their theology that gave rise to the historical-critical method within German academia. His insistence that 'Christian theology has the obligation before God to do its own exegesis of Scripture, in service of the church rather than the academy' (p. 224) should encourage pastors and scholars to prize theological interpretation and Christian tradition while avoiding the harsh polemics that characterized Luther at his worst. Proceeding to discuss soteriology as it developed in later evangelicalism, he chides both the Calvinist and Wesleyan traditions for encouraging a kind of 'reflective faith' (p. 266), an inward speculation of whether one has true faith, rather than simply encouraging 'faith in the sacramental promise of the Gospel as conceived by Luther' (p. 240). Even those who differ with Luther's high sacramental theology, outlined in the 11th chapter, could sympathize with the pastoral concerns Cary raises.

Many readers without rigorous training in philosophy and/or theology might find Cary's volume challenging; however, for such a rich topic, this might be unavoidable. Those who struggle with Protestantism's distinctive contribution to the Great Tradition, desire a serious engagement

with Luther's theology, or are fascinated by the historical antecedents and descendants of Reformation thought will find this book both thorough and enjoyable.

Geoffrey Butler, University of Toronto, Canada