Editorial: The problem with book reviewing

Due to unforeseen circumstances, as the airlines/train companies say, we are running this issue with very few books reviews, in the sure and certain expectation of a plenitude in the next (spring 2025) issue.

But in the meantime, our shortfall has caused me to think about book reviewing.

In the case of just about every journal that includes book reviews it has to be said that the selection of books that get reviewed is often not made with the most rigorous of methods. Keen publishers send advance copies without solicitation, impoverished graduate students need and demand a particular niche and expensive book, the books of a friend or friend of a friend oblige a timely favour (I'll review yours if you review mine), then there is a chance meeting with a publisher at a bookstall. It's all rather random. Moreover, publishing houses are businesses. They are often (if they are in any sense successful) ruthless in knowing their core clientele and how not to alienate those, but expand its reach by wooing the non-aligned, those whose place of belonging is not settled. People who work for publishing houses are human beings, usually of a friendly disposition, which helps in commissioning and selling books and putting up with the egos of authors, and when those people are Christians, they can bring an integrity even a saintliness in befriending authors and readers alike, asking: what do you really need from me? This is often done against the grain of the institutional pressure, to be charming, efficient, and make a good profit, sometimes 'in the name of the Lord'.

Fairly early on as a university-employed academic I was told that book reviews were worthless as publications, for they did not get counted as 'research' by our employers, and that really they justified less than an hour of time to write. If one takes into account a saving of £90 by getting the book for nothing, then perhaps two hours is justified. As Tony Thiselton once said to me, the good news about academic theology books is that they do not have to be read cover to cover. Yet the danger of missing the point by reading too speedily is real. How many books have we read slowly, deliberately and meditatively in any case? It would be genuinely interesting to know. Slow reading, *lectio divina* and all that is commendable, but really deliberate *lectio divina* is usually reserved for classics that come highly recommended through generations of edifying readers, not for works which clamour to be reviewed within the first two to three years of appearing. Further, it is often authors who attract reviews because of their reputation and their latest offering is often given the benefit of the doubt. Are we reviewing this book or the last but one book before that

by this author on which he or she rightly forged a reputation, even when, however, this book is just not as good? Furthermore, the dangers of missing things, even getting the wrong end of the stick, are real enough. Quite often live book reviews at conferences by a panel of 4 or 5 people of a particularly significant-looking book can promise more than they deliver, because one plays safer with the author and friends at the same table or looking beseechingly as the reviewer speaks, or because reviewers are picked to come at it from a variety of angles, and find completely different things to discuss in it, some of which seem rather incidental to the main messages of the book in question.

How do reviews themselves proceed? There are two risks: first, one simply spells out the contents, chapter by chapter. Many publishers now do this anyway in profiling books online. Chapter-precis by chapter-precis is useful if the book for review is in a language other than that of most of the readers. But otherwise, as postgraduate students are told, keep that to a 50% maximum, and the rest should engage the reader with thoughts about the point of the book, its message for us, comparison with other relevant books. Second, the review becomes a vehicle for point-scoring, score-settling, or is lop-sided. This other extreme is where a review gets overly critical, and seems to serve too much the reviewers' opinions. This is what one might call the *London Review of Books* approach, where the reviewer writes an article on a topic and reviews two or three books recently published on that topic along the way (fodder to his cannon, grist to her mill), but that approach is exceptional and mostly to be resisted. There should be some amount of judgement and opinion-sharing beyond 'yes' or 'no', but this should not dominate a review. One should try to say what the book does offer more than what it does not. 'What I would have said had I written this book?' is not a good approach. We need to take the book on its own terms, to try not to think of 'which stable does this come?' and to appreciate it according to its own merits.

Now, not to prejudge does not mean to refrain from contextualising. For it can be illuminating of the book to illustrate how this book came out of a certain project, or is the follow-up to something, or belongs to a series, or is a response to the recent book by X. It is arguable that the Reformed churches and their theologians do a better than average job in theology being Church-facing while of a good academic standard, which perhaps says something about the educational level of the Reformed demographic. Yet there is always the worry of existing in silos, only being interested in the hot topics of controversy (children and the Lord's Supper/the nature of Scriptural authority/justification, or whatever.)

In this day and age of podcasts, 'vlogs' and substacks (all ugly words, incidentally) are books valid currency in any case? For academic employ-

ers, research articles are more valuable per page (roughly two articles = one book). Neither books nor much less their reviews are as valued as they might be. Even government research funders (it would appear) care more about the gist and the impact of a book than about the detail and the finer points of the argument.

Some amount of intelligent 'corrections' or perhaps simply 'questions' are to be encouraged. We get as sick of blandly positive endorsements as we do of dismissive put-downs, for these are but two sides of the one coin. It is too easy for publishers to send books they think we will like; they are probably right, but then a journal becomes an echo chamber. 'This book will be of interest' is not the same as 'those who like this, will also like that'. A book we don't agree with can be a book we can learn from.

But there is no substitute for creative scholarship based on careful research leading to arguments and points that can help the church to think better about a range of topics they might not otherwise consider. Other things will be learned depending on one's starting-place, but I can say that one will learn about the relationship of creation and redemption from the figure of Duncan Maclean as related by Donald Meek, in an expanded version of a section of his plenary talk to the 'Outlanders for the Faith' Church History Conference at Highland Theological College in April 2024. Or about the logic of the purpose of defending the faith with arms, at least given the way early modern Scots thought about war and just causes—in the essay by Alasdair Macleod. The view of Christ's Atonement as one of satisfaction and vicarious repentance and how a theological controversy was handled in the Kirk of the 1830s is outlined by Nick Needham. Then there is a most helpful overview of how the life of an eminent professional natural scientist, who was also no mean theologian, had his life and work informed by the theme and actual events of 'revival': this presented by Bruce Ritchie. All four papers were trialled at that very enjoyable Church History Conference at Highland Theological College. The final essay is by a Korean student working at Vancouver School of Theology. After a summary of the thought of Jürgen Moltmann (1926-2024), the story of his direct influence on the Pentecostal Church in South Korea is told, and implications are drawn, leading to a fuller, while not wholly uncritical appreciation of Moltmann's efforts to balance traditional systematic theology with biblical and experiential features.

As I said at the top, this issue is a bit short of book reviews. But the ones we have are fairly substantial. The editor will seek to evade all responsibility if his own penned review fails to live up to what he outlined above in this editorial….

Mark W. Elliott. All Hallows' Eve, 2024.

At The Rainbow's End: The Natural World In The Gaelic Spiritual Verse Of The Rev. Duncan Maclean (1796-1871), Glenorchy

Donald E. Meek

My first acquaintance with the Gaelic verse of the Rev. Duncan MacLean came as a memorable surprise. During the 1990s, I was Professor of Celtic at the University of Aberdeen, but, in spite of the title, the job seemed to entail much more in the way of administration than of real scholarship. Because of the ceaseless demands of bureaucracy, I rarely had the opportunity to visit the Queen Mother Library just across the road from the Taylor Building in Aberdeen. One afternoon, however, I had just sufficient spare time to reach the library and to explore a few of its Gaelic shelves. It was a pleasure to browse its nineteenth-century Gaelic material, in which I had a special interest. Most of the books were unassuming volumes in brown or green or blue covers, as was the common style of that period. Titles were equally unassuming, as was exemplified fully by a small volume called *Gaelic Hymns D. MacLean* on its front cover. The title page was a little more revealing: *Laoidhean agus Dàin. Le Donnachadh Mac-Gilleadhain, Ministeir na h-Eaglais Saoire ann an Gleannurchaidh* ('Hymns and Poems. By Duncan MacLean, Minister of the Free Church in Glenorchy'). In this instance, however, it was clear from the neatly-tooled cover, with a patterned border and gold lettering, that a conscious effort had been made to add dignity to the design. It had been printed in Glasgow in 1868 by the eminent Gaelic printer and publisher, Archibald Sinclair, 62 Argyle Street, with the support of MacLachlan and Stewart in Edinburgh, and smaller publishers in Oban, Inverness and Stornoway.

Until that point, I had never heard of the Rev. Duncan MacLean or even been aware of his Gaelic verse. As I perused the book, I was captivated immediately by its contents, and I will always remember standing by that book-shelf, engrossed in exploring MacLean's introduction and poems. I had expected to find what some unsympathetic critics have termed 'versified dogma', but what might more fairly be called 'metrical sermons', in keeping with the style of much nineteenth-century Gaelic religious verse. Instead, I found a variety of poems and songs and more profoundly meditative pieces which carried a strong Christian message, but had been fashioned in a skilfully artistic manner, drawing much of

their imagery from the natural world of Perthshire and Argyllshire. The composer clearly did not suffer from an overdose of what I have sometimes called 'evangelical gnosticism', which ignores the reality that we human beings have been placed in a physical environment which speaks of the power of the Creator God. For me, this was indeed a pot of literary gold at the end of the rainbow, an image which MacLean used to good effect in one of his poems, discussed below.

IDENTIFYING THE POET

Who, then, was the Rev. Duncan MacLean, whose verse I have described elsewhere as 'one of the hidden jewels of the nineteenth century'?[1] True to his love of the natural world and of his own family patch, MacLean included in his anthology a fine poem entitled 'Sealladh o Mhullach Shròn a' Chlachain' ('View from the Summit of Sròn a' Chlachain'), which rooted him firmly in his native heath.[2] Sròn a' Chlachain is an eminence which rises above and to the west of Killin, and it provides a commanding view of the village of Killin itself, Loch Tay, and the surrounding countryside. The poem is in the traditional Gaelic style of a farewell, a leave-taking, in which MacLean, who had climbed to the top of Sròn a' Chlachain, surveys his native landscape, and reflects on the many changes which have occurred since he had been raised there as a boy. His deep empathy with the landscape flows out of every line, like the River Dochart itself, which, having surged boisterously through rapids, meets the River Lochay, and is tamed in a matrimonial 'embrace' with the other stream:

'S mi am shuidh' air an tulaich, air mullach an aonaich,
Gun duine am chuideachd, gu buileach am aonar,
Tha smaointeannan iomadh air m' anam ag aomadh
Bha fada nan cadal, ach innseam an t-aobhar.

As I sit on the hillock at the summit of the slope,
With no other company, completely on my own,
Thoughts in profusion descend upon my soul,
Thoughts that were long dormant, but let me give the reason.

Tha mo shùil air Loch Tatha 's gach faileas as bòidhche
A chì mi na bhroilleach, mar chaoin-uchd caomh-òighe,
Mar leanabh na chadal am madainn na h-òige –
A ghaoth, buin gu caomh ris mun caochail a ghlòir-mhais'!

---

1 Meek, 'Gaelic Literature in the Nineteenth Century', 265.
2 MacLean, *Gaelic Hymns*, 98-100.

My eye rests on Loch Tay and every most beautiful shadow
That I see on its breast, like the smooth bosom of a beautiful maiden,
Like a child asleep in the morning of youth –
O wind, deal with it gently lest its glory should perish!

Tha 'n sealladh tha sgaoil' air gach taobh agus làimh dhiom
Làn maise mar b' àbhaist, gnùis nàdair gun sgraing oirr',
Na coilltean cho ùrar, luchd-ciùil air gach crann diubh,
Len ceilearan siùbhlach – mo rùn-sa gach àm iad!

The view which extends on each side and direction
Is full of beauty as always, nature's face is unscowling,
The woods so refreshing, musicians on their every branch,
With their fluent melodies – they are my joy every time!

Tha Dochard na dheannaibh a' teannadh gu Lòchaidh
An coinneamh a chèile, bean bheusach chiùin chòmhnard,
'S nuair thig i na ghlacaibh 's a naisgear iad còmhla,
Grad thrèigidh a bhuirb' e, is strìochdaidh a mhòrchuis.

Dochart surges at speed as it approaches the Lochay,
To encounter his spouse, the mannerly, smooth, gentle lady,
And when she is embraced and they are bonded together,
Suddenly his roughness departs, and his arrogance yields.

MacLean goes on to depict the splendour of Glen Dochart and Glen Lochay, with their slopes and hollows, rivers, plains and birdlife. Against those unchanging scenes, he sets the transience of human life, and reflects on the disappearance of those near and dear to him, but pre-eminently his parents:

Tha smùid o thaigh m' athar a' dìreadh mar bha i
Na cearclaibh 's na dualaibh rèir a duail is a nàdair,
Ach cà bheil an t-athair a dh'altraim mi tràthail?
Is caomhag nam mnathan, cà bheil i, mo mhàthair?

The smoke from my father's house rises as always,
In circles and twists, in accord with its nature,
But where is the father who nurtured me early,
And that dear one among women, where is she, my mother?

Such leave-taking verse, with its nostalgic underlying note of *Ubi sunt*? ('Where are they [now]?'), is not uncommon in nineteenth-century Gaelic or English literature. While imbued with some of the softer sentiments

of the wider British Romantic movement, often wedded to landscape, MacLean's poem acquires its strength and memorability from its close observation of nature and its intimate pinpointing of familiar places, districts and landmarks – Disher, Ben Lawers, Kinella, Achamore, Killin, Ben Leimhinn, and Breadalbane. To these places and their personal associations, he bids a fond final farewell, with a profound sense that he too is 'moving on':

Slàn leis na sruthain mum faicte an t-iasgair!
Slàn leis na mòintean 's am faighte am fiadhach!
Slàn leis na slèibhtean, 's Beinn Lèimhinn, mo chiad ghràdh!
Slàn le Bràghaid Albainn sam b' ainmeil sìol Dhiarmaid!

Farewell to the streams where you would once see the fisher!
Farewell to the moorlands where once there was hunting!
Farewell to the uplands, and to Ben Leimhinn, my first love!
Farewell to Breadalbane, where Diarmaid's famous seed flourished!

The poem may have been composed shortly before his book was published in 1868, a mere three years before his death at the Free Church Manse, Glenorchy, on 26 December 1871 'in the 76th year of his age and the 50th of his ministry'.[3]

EDUCATION, FORMATION, AND MINISTRY

In sharp contrast to MacLean's heartfelt poem, the Old Parish Register for Killin blandly records that he was born to Archibald McLean and Sarah McKay at 'End of Dochart', and noted his baptism on 4 July 1796 as their 'lawful Son bap. Called Duncan'.[4] Nothing is known about his schooling, but his warm reference in his leave-taking poem to 'the school-house [which remained] without change or mutation', in spite of the flight of its pupils like bees leaving the honey-comb, suggests that he was educated initially at the local school in Killin.

Little is recorded about MacLean's spiritual formation, but strong evangelical movements were evident in Perthshire in the early nineteenth century, and it seems likely that these bore fruit in his life. As a young man, he had listened to the powerful preaching of the Rev. John MacDonald (1779-1849), 'The Apostle of the North', who visited Perthshire

3 *Brechin Advertiser*, 2 January 1872.
4 OPR Births 361/Killin 273.

regularly. In his elegy on Thomas Chalmers, MacLean refers to the lasting effect of MacDonald's oratory:[5]

B' òg a chual' mi do theagasg,
Ged bu bheag dheth a thuig mi da bhrìgh;
Gidheadh thàin' e dhachaigh
Is shàth e mar shaighead am chrìdh';
Rinn an dùrachd a nochd thu,
An gràdh bha ad labhairt 's ad chainnt
Orm drùdhadh a lean rium,
'S am bharail a leanas gach àm.

I was young when I heard your preaching,
Although I understood little of its essence;
Yet it bore home upon upon me,
And, like an arrow, thrust itself into my heart;
The passion that you showed,
The love in your speech and your talk,
Sank into me in a lasting manner,
And, in my opinion, will always remain.

After his schooling, MacLean proceeded to the Universities of Aberdeen and Glasgow, and was first ordained as a missionary minister at Benbecula in 1823, translated to Salen, Mull, in 1828, then to Kilbrandon, Argyll, in 1835, and finally to Glenorchy in 1837, to which parish he was presented by the Duke of Argyll. He had evidently become uneasy with patronage by the mid-1830s, as his surviving correspondence shows his concern that parishioners should be consulted in his call to Kilbrandon. He was soon to become a participant in the Disruption, Signing the Act of Separation and Deed of Demission in 1843, he became a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, and in December wrote to the Marquis of Breadalbane, the proprietor of the Glenorchy estate, with a view to obtaining a manse at Croft Brackly.[6]

As a minister, MacLean gained a reputation for hard work and eloquence. The *Oban Times* reported in June 1871 that 'the venerable Rev. Mr Maclean of Glenorchy conducted divine service in the Free Church [in Oban] in the morning [of the previous Sunday]', and continued:[7]

5 MacLean, *Gaelic Hymns*, 24.

6 Biographical, bibliographical and other references relating to MacLean are assembled conveniently in https://www.ecclegen.com/ministers-mac2

7 *Oban Times*, 3 June 1871.

> Mr Maclean is now enjoying a month's holiday in Oban, a luxury which, we believe, he has seldom indulged in through the long course of his ministerial career. Mr Maclean's numerous friends will be glad to learn that, though advanced in years, he continues to be hale and hearty and to preserve the fervid eloquence and power of mind for which, in his younger days, he was so justly admired.

GAELIC LITERARY BACKGROUND

When Duncan MacLean was a young man, Killin and its surroundings were a Gaelic-rich area, strongly associated with Gaelic literature, most notably through the translation of the Gaelic New Testament, published in Edinburgh in 1767. The translation was attributed chiefly to the Rev. James Stewart, parish minister of Killin, who was part of a wider 'Killin Circle' of prominent literary figures.[8] MacLean, who mentions Killin parish church in his leave-taking poem, would have been brought up with an inevitable awareness of such important Gaelic literary activity in the district. He would have known that the Gaelic New Testament had been seen through the press in Edinburgh by a native of Strathyre, namely Dugald Buchanan (1716-68), the spiritual poet who became the Forfeited Estates' schoolmaster at Kinloch Rannoch, and who may well have contributed significantly to the process of translation.[9] Buchanan is one of four Gaelic poets noted in the preface to MacLean's *Gaelic Hymns*.[10] Buchanan made extensive use of the imagery of the natural world in his verse,[11] and his influence can be detected in some of MacLean's compositions.

Beyond religious prose and verse, MacLean was thoroughly familiar with the celebration of the natural world in the secular Gaelic compositions of Donnchadh Bàn nan Òran ('Fair-haired Duncan [MacIntyre] of the Songs', 1724-1812), a native of Druim Liaghairt, Glenorchy, whom he describes in his 1843 account of the parish of Glenorchy and Inishail for the *New Statistical Account of Scotland*.[12] As MacLean notes, MacIntyre composed a major panegyric poem on the beauties of Beinn Dòbhrain (Ben Doran), rising above Bridge of Orchy, where he was once a gamekeeper.[13] MacIntyre later composed a leave-taking song, 'Cead Deireannach nam Beann' ('Final Leave-taking of the Bens'), when, having moved

8 Meek, *Dugald Buchanan*, 11-20.
9 Meek, 'Evangelicalism, Ossianism, and the Enlightenment'.
10 MacLean, *Gaelic Hymns*, 7.
11 Thomson, *Eighteenth Century Gaelic Poetry*, 139-43.
12 MacLean, 'Glenurchy and Inishail', 83, 94-95.
13 Thomson, *Eighteenth Century Gaelic Poetry*, 62-71.

to Edinburgh in 1766, he visited the mountain and the surrounding area for the last time on 19 September 1802.[14] We may wonder whether MacIntyre's song was in MacLean's mind as he composed his own farewell to Killin and its environs.

MacIntyre's portrayal of the natural world was part of a wider poetic trend in Gaelic composition in the eighteenth century. Its principal exponent was the dynamic and irrepressible Ardnamurchan poet, Alexander MacDonald (c. 1690-c. 1770), whose depictions of summer and winter set a trend. Professor Derick Thomson noted:[15]

> There were native Gaelic models for seasonal description, but he [MacDonald] developed the genre in a detailed and individual way, one of his favourite techniques…being the use of a series of adjectives ending in *-ach*, which often produce a compressed and vivid characterisation… His seasonal songs were to provide the clear models for a series by other eighteenth-century poets, from Duncan Bàn MacIntyre to Ewen MacLachlan at the end of the century.

MacDonald's adjectival technique is detectable in some of MacLean's verse on seasonal themes, discussed below.

Wider non-Gaelic influences were at work too, shaping MacDonald's work and that of others, including MacLean. Chief among these was the seasonal poetry of James Thomson (1700-48), a Scot from Ednam who became a tutor and writer in London, and whose work was first published between 1726 and 1730.[16] No less potent as a highly creative catalyst on both sides of the Border were James Macpherson's 'translations' of the 'epics' of the legendary Gaelic poet, Ossian, which gained controversial attention in Britain, Ireland, and Europe after 1760. Macpherson, a native Gaelic speaker from Badenoch, was also greatly admired by literary-minded Gaels, who responded positively to his portrayal of the Highlands as the homeland of Fingal and his warriors. His descriptions of the Highland landscape imparted a transformational glow to former perceptions of the region, and helped to develop broader romantic interpretations of the natural world in prose, poetry and art. Gaelic-speaking ministers were among Macpherson's most ardent admirers and defenders, and MacLean appears to have been one of their number. [17] He refers to the Highlands as 'tìr nam Fiann' ('the land of the Fian/Fingalian warriors') in

[14] Meek, *Caran*, 6-15, 395, 476.
[15] Thomson, *Eighteenth Century Gaelic Poetry*, 13, 20-31.
[16] Sambrook, *Seasons*, xxi-xxii.
[17] Meek, 'The Sublime Gael',

a poem which forms the *envoi* to his 1868 book,[18] and he thought that 'the Hesperides of Ossian' was located near Lochawe.[19]

MACLEAN'S PRE-1868 PUBLICATIONS

Duncan MacLean seems to have developed an early and timely interest in Gaelic literature, and specifically the composition of Gaelic verse. By the late 1820s, he had honed his skills sufficiently to be able to provide poems for the pioneering Gaelic minister, the Rev. Dr Norman MacLeod (*Caraid nan Gàidheal*, 'The Friend of the Gaels'), an 'Ossianic' enthusiast who was the founding father of Gaelic periodical literature, aimed at Gaelic speakers who had become literate through the various Gaelic school initiatives, but lacked appropriate Gaelic reading material.[20] MacLean's first published poems were accepted for MacLeod's innovative journal, *An Teachdaire Gae'lach* ('The Gaelic Messenger'), which appeared between 1829 and 1831. In the order of their publication in *An Teachdaire Gae'lach* (*ATG*), and in their subsequent positions in *Gaelic Hymns* of 1868 (*GH*), these poems were:

'Dàn don Bhogha Fhrois' ['Poem to the Rainbow'], *ATG*, II (June 1829), 42-43: 'Am Bogha Frois', *GH*, 41-42

'Ceòl' ['Music'], *ATG*, III (July 1829), 68: *GH*, 49

'Dàn don Bhìoball' ['Poem to the Bible'], first part, *ATG*, V (September 1829), 115: 'Am Bìoball', *GH*, 43-45

'An Nallaig' ['Christmas'], *ATG*, IX (January 1830),189-90: 'Latha Nollaig', *GH*, 30-31

'An t-Sàbaid' ['The Sabbath'], *ATG*, XVI (August 1830), 78-80: 'Latha 'n Tighearna' ['The Lord's Day'], *GH*, 50-52

'An Crìosdaidh gabhail a chead den t-saoghal' ['The Christian taking his leave of the world'], *ATG*, XVII (September 1830), 103: 'An Crìosdaidh air Leabaidh a Bhàis' ['The Christian on his deathbed'], *GH*, 33-35

'Laoidh' ['Hymn'], *ATG*, XVIII (October 1830), 123: *GH*, 89 (translation of a hymn by Bishop Reginald Heber – see 'The 1868 anthology' below)

18 MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 9.
19 MacLean, 'Glenorchy and Inishail', 86.
20 Kidd, 'Early Gaelic Periodicals'.

'Dàn don Bhìoball' ['Poem to the Bible'], second part, *ATG*, XXII (February 1831), 239-40: *GH*, 46-47.[21]
It is evident from an editorial note introducing the second section of 'Dàn don Bhìoball' that the Rev. Norman MacLeod esteemed his contributions highly.

MacLean published his poems under the penname, *(Am) Fìor Ghael* ('[The] True Gael'), which is indicative of his strong identification with Gaelic culture. In fact, he was supportive of the *An Teachdaire Gae'lach* to the extent that he composed a substantial poem welcoming the (personified) 'Messenger'. He celebrated the 'Messenger's' potential for strengthening Gaelic customs and traditions at a time when the Gaelic population was being thinned noticeably by emigration, with a profound sense of loss for both the wider culture and for individuals like himself, who witnessed the departure of the former inhabitants of certain parts of the Highlands – an elegiac theme which found eloquent expression in his poem, 'Tuireadh an Fhògarraich' ('The Keening of the Exile').[22] As he saluted the 'Messenger', he imagined a family gathered round their fireplace while reading the new journal.[23] In associating himself so firmly with *An Teachdaire Gae'lach*, MacLean was clearly of a similar mind to MacLeod, and MacLeod's encouragement must surely have strengthened his literary aspirations.

Publications by MacLean in the later 1830s have not yet been traced, but he was active in the 1840s. In 1848 he produced a small book, *Cumha an Diadhair Urramaich Dr Thomas Chalmers a chaochail anns a' bhliadhna 1847 agus Dà Dhàn Spioradail Eile* ('Lament for the Reverend Divine Dr Thomas Chalmers who died in the year 1847 and Two Other Spiritual Poems'), printed in Glasgow by Duncan MacVean. The 'Lament' was also the first item in *GH*.[24] The two other 'spiritual poems' were 'Rabhadh don Mhuinntir Neo-iompaichte' ('Warning to Unconverted People'), reprinted in *GH*,[25] and 'An Tuil' ('The Flood'), reprinted as the second item in *GH*.[26]

By the late 1850s, MacLean had earned a sufficiently high reputation to act as a judge of other poets' outputs. In 1857, the 'Rev. Duncan MacLean, Glenorchy; Rev. Dr Smith, Inveraray; and the Rev. Duncan Macnab, Glas-

---

21 I am deeply indebted to Dr Sheila Kidd, University of Glasgow, for supplying these references.

22 MacLean, *Gaelic Hymns*, 101-4.

23 *An Teachdaire Gae'lach,* VI [September 1829], pp. 133-35. Kidd, 'Early Gaelic Periodicals'.

24 MacLean, *Gaelic Hymns*, 11-26.

25 MacLean, *Gaelic Hymns*, 63-67.

26 MacLean, *Gaelic Hymns*, 26-30.

gow' were the judges in a competition organised by the Glasgow Celtic Society 'for the best Gaelic poem (not to exceed 100 lines) on the military services of the Highland regiments during the late war'. First Prize of £5.5/- was awarded to 'William Livingstone, tailor, Dale Street, Glasgow', a prominent Gaelic poet.[27]

As far as is known to date, no Gaelic sermons by MacLean have survived. However, a taste of his prose style is provided by his introductions to his 1848 volume and also his 1868 anthology. These show that he had a rich Gaelic vocabulary, teaming with synonyms, and a talent for thinking in figurative terms. In the introduction to the former, he writes:[28]

> O! Thigeadh don chlàrsaich bhith da-rìreadh fonnmhor, labhar, agus milis, is don chlàrsair a thogadh am fonn a bhith teòma, deas-làmhach, a chuireadh cliù agus moladh an diadhair urramaich an cèill air chòir; cha chùis nàire no maslaidh le fear an dàin ged thilgt' air gun tàinig e fada, ro fhada, goirid san ionnsaigh dhàna a thug e.
>
> *O! It would befit that harp to be indeed tuneful, eloquent, and sweet, and the harper who raised the melody to be skilful and nimble-handed, that would articulate properly the renown and praise of that reverend divine; it would be no reason for reproach or shame upon the poet though he should be accused of falling far, very far, short in the bold endeavour on which he had embarked.*

His command of English style is more than evident in his contribution to the *New Statistical Account*, where he indulges his love of the natural features of the parish of Glenurchay and Inishail, including the valleys and rivers running eastwards to Perthshire.[29]

THE 1868 ANTHOLOGY

MacLean's 1868 anthology begins with an introduction which argues his case for composing hymns. He appeals to the precedent of earlier centuries, from the songs of Deborah, Baruch, Hannah, Samuel, David and Solomon in the Old Testament, to the hymns of Martin Luther at the time of the Reformation – *laoidhean brìoghmhor, blasda Lutheir* ('Luther's meaningful, tasteful hymns') – which inspired and encouraged people in difficult times. The value of hymns in a specifically Gaelic context was demonstrated by the compositions of Dugald Buchanan, Strathyre and Kinloch Rannoch, the Rev. James MacGregor (1759-1830), from Port-

[27] *Inverness Advertiser*, 8 December 1857.
[28] MacLean, *Cumha*, iv.
[29] MacLean, 'Glenurchay and Inishail', 82-103.

more (Comrie parish), the Rev. Dr John MacDonald, minister of Ferintosh, and John Morrison (c. 1796-1852), the Harris blacksmith. Though referring to these poets, he dismisses the idea that he regarded himself as the equal of his Gaelic predecessors. His book was produced in the belief that its contents might be useful to others. He and poetry had been 'courting' for many years, and, had he been ambitious, he would not have waited until he was going grey and balding before publishing his book. MacLean sends his volume on its way with an appropriate poem of blessing, a form of *envoi* attested in the first Gaelic printed book, published in 1567, namely John Carswell's Classical Gaelic translation of John Knox's *Book of Common Order*.[30] This demonstrates MacLean's deep scholarly familiarity with Gaelic literary conventions, as well as with spiritual and other forms of verse.

The 1868 anthology gathers all MacLean's previously-published verse, but adds a significant amount of fresh material composed by himself. Near the end, it also includes a small selection of hymns and poems which he had translated or adapted from the works of Isaac Watts (1674-1748), Augustus Toplady (1740-78), Henry Kirke White (1785-1806),[31] and (Bishop) Reginald Heber (1783-1826), perhaps best known as the composer of the hymn, 'All things bright and beautiful'. MacLean translated noticeably more specimens of White and Heber, with a preference for Heber.[32] This is important in demonstrating the external, non-Gaelic influences to which he was exposed, predominantly from the Romantic group of English hymn-composers of the early nineteenth century.[33] Like his predecessor Dugald Buchanan, who was a significant translator of earlier English verse, and who also made extensive use of imagery drawn from the natural world, MacLean operated within an intertextual and bilingual English/Gaelic context, and was doubtless influenced by English models. Through them, he may have absorbed some of the principles of the wider Romantic movement, which commonly used features of the landscape to carry the feeling, mood or thought of the composer, though he did not lack Gaelic precedents.

It is certainly noticeable that MacLean's verse has a strong personal dimension, more revealing of the self than is normal with most Gaelic composers of hymns, and much more evidently imbued with an attachment to the physical environment. However, his own compositions, tempered by his knowledge of Gaelic literature, are very different from the

30 Thomson, *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh*, 13, 181.
31 Fulford, *Henry Kirke White*.
32 MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 80-91.
33 Watson, *The English Hymn*, 300-34.

English hymns of the Romantic period, as they contain much more specific pictures of the natural world than the rather generalised and occasional references to landscape characteristic of the latter.

RAINBOW, FLOOD AND STREAM

MacLean's use of natural images in his verse takes different forms, depending on the subject. When employing nature in what may be termed a broadly didactic role in his longer poems, he often chooses a single theme or image which he develops as an integral part of the composition, but with different emphases as befits his message. This can be demonstrated with reference to three examples. The first of these presents the poem in its entirety, but the following two provide only a selection of verses from each poem.

Am Bogha Frois[34]
The Rainbow

A chuspair àlainn, ghràsmhoir, òrbhuidh,
Urrais àird air slàint' is còmhnadh,
Biodh d' fhiamh ghàire ort an còmhnaidh –
eall an gràdh orm ri uchd dòrainn.

Beautiful, grace-filled, golden object,
Lofty warrant of salvation and succour,
May you wear your smile for ever –
Look on me with love when I face trouble.

Nuair a reubas stoirm an t-adhar,
Cur nan dùil air mhire-chatha,
Laigheas oidhch' air uchd an latha,
Faiceam soillse do ghnùis fhlathail.

When a storm tears the sky to pieces,
Stirring the elements to battle-ardour,
When night lies upon the day's breast,
May I see the glow of your noble countenance.

Cuir an cèill dhomh, theachdair' dhìleis,
Gealladh aoibhneach Dhè na fìrinn;
Innis dhomh am briathraibh mìne
Chaoidh nach sgriosar sinn le dìle.

[34] MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 41-42.

Expound to me, faithful messenger,
The joyful promise of the God of truth;
Reassure me, in gentle words,
That we will never [again] be destroyed by a flood.

Nuair chìthear thu, dhrochaid bhòidheach,
Crocht' os cionn nan tuilte mòra,
Seallam-s' ort san àm le sòlas
Mar an ròd gu rìoghachd na glòire.

When you are visible, beautiful bridge,
Suspended above the mighty torrents,
May I look upon you then with solace
As the road to the realm of glory.

Seallam ort, a choroin sgiamhaich,
Mar ro-eàrlais air Mac Dhia dhuinn,
Chleith na fheòil àrd ghlòir a Dhiadhachd
Rin sìor sheallam ri àm diachainn.

May I look at you, lovely crown,
As the guarantee of God's son on our side,
Who hid in his flesh the high glory of his Divinity,
[And] to whom I may always look in time of trouble.

Nuair bha mi 'm leanabh aotrom, gòrach,
Dearc le iongnadh air do bhòidhchead,
Dh'innseadh dhomh, mar sgeul gun sgleò e,
Nan glacainn thu, gum mealainn stòras.

When I was a light-headed silly youngster,
Looking in wonder at your beauty,
I was told, as a tale untarnished,
That, if I'd catch you, I'd revel in wealth.

O raon gu raon 's tric chuir mi 'n ruaig ort,
'S an dòchas bhaoth gun tugainn buaidh ort,
Ach char is mheall thu mi gam bhuaireadh,
Mar iomad faileas faoin on uair sin.

From field to field I often chased you,
In foolish hope that I could win you,
But you deceived and tricked me with your tempting,
Like many a vain shadow since that time.

Ach ged mheall thu mi am bharail,
'S nach do chùm thu rium do ghealladh,
Ged a chaochail glòir do ghathan,
'S ged a sgaoil iad feadh an adhair,

But although you deceived me in my notion,
And you did not keep your promise to me,
And though your rays' glory faded,
And though they scattered through the sky,

Dearcam ort, 's na ceileam uam e,
'N Tì nach trèig mi ri uchd cruadail,
'N Tì bheir slàinte dhomh is sòlas,
S leis nach meallar chaoidh mi 'm dhòchas.

May I gaze upon You, and let me not hide it,
[As] the One who will not forsake me when facing hardship,
The One who will give me salvation and solace,
And in whom my hope will never be deceived.

Nuair bhios tuiltean brùchd' air m' anam,[35]
'S tonnan buaireis a' dol tharam,
Le sùil creidimh riut an còmhnaidh,
Ìos', bi dhòmhs' ad bhogha dòchais.

When the floods surge over [are heavy on] my soul,
And waves of trouble sweep across me,
With the eye of faith resting on you always,
Jesus! Be to me a rainbow of hope!

An Tuil[36]

The Flood

Tha ghrian anns na h-àrdaibh ag èirigh gun ghruaim,
'S an saoghal bu shàmhach a' dùsgadh à shuain;
Tha ceòlraidh na coille a' gleus' an cruit chiùil,
Cur fàilt' air a' mhadainn le aighear is sùnnd.

---

35 trom air m' anam ('heavy on my soul'), *ATG* 1829.

36 MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 26-36. The trigger for this composition may have been a flash flood, which sometimes occurred in the Highlands, most notably in August 1829, when a 'Muckle Spate' struck the Spey valley (Lauder, *Great Floods of August 1829*).

The sun in the skies has no frown as it rises,
And the quiet world awakens out of its sleep;
The musicians of the wood are tuning their harps,
Welcoming the morning with joy and good cheer.

Tha maise a' Chèitein air rèidhlean nam beann,
Air coille nam badan, 's air lagan nan gleann;
Sgaoil samhradh na maise a bhrat air gach taobh,
'S air aghaidh a' chruinne tha gean agus aoibh.

The beauty of May is on the slopes of the bens,
On the wood with its clumps, and the hollow of the glens;
The summer of splendour has spread its coat on each side,
And the face of the world shows joy and goodwill.

Tha choille a' lùbadh fo dhriùchd a' mhìos Mhàigh,
Barr-ghuc air gach fiùran, 's gur cùbhraidh am fàil';
'S am barra nan ògan tha còisridh nam fonn,
Len ribhide ceòlmhor, 's len òrain nach trom.

The forest is bending under the dew of May's month,
With buds on each sapling, and the fragrance is sweet;
On the tops of the branches is the choir that is tuneful
With their musical reeds, and no sombre songs.

Noah tells of the impending flood, and builds his boat in readiness, but nobody listens. People are having fun and pleasure, when suddenly the weather changes.

Ach dhorchaich an latha, tha 'n t-adhar fo ghruaim,
Tha cuantan a' beucaich, 's gur dèistneach am fuaim;
Tha 'n talamh a' clisgeadh, 's a' briosgadh gu bhonn,
Bhrùchd an cuan thar a' chladaich le sadraich a thonn.

But the day has suddenly darkened, and the sky has grown surly,
The oceans are roaring, and their sound is horrendous;
The ground is now trembling, and shaking to its foundations,
The sea has surged over the shoreline with the wallop of its waves.

Chaidh sgaoileadh gu h-obann sa chomann bha baoth,
O! Is ìosal an cridhe bha mireag rin taobh;
Ri mionaid na h-uaire ghlac uamhann is fiamh
An saoghal, mo thruaighe, dh'fhàs suarach mu Dhia.

The light-headed company has been suddenly scattered,
And Oh! Downcast is the heart that danced by their side;
In a mere minute, fear and terror have captured
The world that – alas! – had grown indifferent to God.

Tha 'm bàs ann air mhire, a' milleadh 's a' sgath,
A' sàthadh gun tioma 's gach cridhe a ghath;
Mar iolair an fhàsaich, le àbhachd gun truas,
Ag òl a sheachd sàth de bhlàth-fhuil nan uan.

Now death is there dancing, spoiling and cutting,
Thrusting its merciless shaft right into each heart;
Like the eagle of the wilds, with its pitiless pleasure,
Drinking its seven-times fill of the warm blood of the lambs.

Tha 'n dìle a' sgaoileadh gu h-aognaidh 's gu bras,
An dòchas nach faoin e gum faodar dol às;
Tha 'n òige 's an aois ri saothair gun stàth,
À glacaibh an aoig ud cha saorar gu bràth.

The flood is now spreading, so swift and so deadly,
Hoping that it isn't so weak that anyone will escape;
Youth and old age make an effort that's hopeless,
As none will ever escape from that killer's clutches.

The final verse of the poem invests the Ark with a New Testament nuance:

Ach faic i an Àirc air bharra nan sùgh,
Gun chombaist, gun acair, gun acfhainn, gun siùil,
A' gabhail a cùrsa fo stiùireadh Mhic Dhè,
'S i torrach le dòchas an òg chruinne-chè.

But look at the Ark on the tops of the billows,
Without compass or anchor, without tackle or sails,
Maintaining her course with God's Son to guide her,
And pregnant with the hope of the freshly-made world.

Uisge na Beatha[37]
The Water of Life

'S e Eòin fhuair an sealladh,
An sealladh ro-ghràsmhor,

[37] MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 35-38, based on *Revelation*, 22: 1.

An sealladh do-labhairt,
An sealladh ro-àghmhor,
Nuair o chathair na Trianaid,
Na fhianais 's na làthair,
Bhrùchd uisge na h-abhainn
Sa bheil glanadh is slàinte!

What a vision John had,
A most gracious vision,
An unspeakable vision,
A most splendid vision,
When from the throne of the Trinity,
In his presence before him,
The river's water surged forth,
With its cleansing salvation!

An abhainn neo-thruaillidh,
Nam buadhan nach fàilnich,
Gun ghoinne air uisg' innt'
'N tart earraich no samhraidh,
Na h-ìocshlainte dhrùidhteach
Dh' anam ciùirte is cràiteach
Nì ghlanadh is ionnlaid
Is iompach' gu slàinte.

The unpolluted river
Of unfailing virtues,
With no lack of water
In spring's drought or summer's,
Providing a penetrating balm
For the pained troubled soul,
To cleanse it and wash it,
And turn it to saving health.

'S cha shruthan beag suarach,
'S uisge ruadh troimhe chèil' ann,
No tàchar dubh mòintich,
Gun bheòshlaint, gun èifeachd,
Losgain 'g iomairt an smàg ann,
'S nithibh gràndа is dèistneach,
Ach fìor-uisge fallain, gun ghainne, gun èirig.

It's no mean little trickle,
Containing brown curdled water,
Or moor's black choking weed,

Without effect or sustenance,
Or frogs crawling in it,
And dirty detestable matters,
But true healthy water, abundant and free.

'S ionann 's tobar nan gleanntan
'S nam beanntanan fàsail,
Nach tiormaich san t-samhradh
Ged thig cranntachd is blàths oirnn,
A bhrùchdas gun ghainne
Mar ghloinne cho àillidh,
An tobar om brùchd siud,
Am bùrn a tha slàinteil.

It is like the well of the glens
And the desolate mountains,
Which will not run dry in summer,
Though searing wind and heat hit us,
But which pours unrestricted
As beautiful as glass,
The well from which surges
That health-giving water.

Tha 'n abhainn seo treòrach
Don mhòr-chuan on tàinig,
An cuan sin gun chladach,
An cuan sin gun tràghadh,
An cuan sin gun lìonadh,
Cuan sìorraidh a' ghràidh sin,
Tha neo-chrìochnach san Diadhachd,
'S tha 'n Crìosd na mhuir slàinte.

This river leads on
To the great ocean of its source,
That ocean without shore,
That ocean unebbing,
That ever-full ocean,
That eternal ocean of love,
Which is unending in the Godhead,
And is in Christ a sea of salvation.

MUSIC AND MEDITATION

In his shorter, more lyrical compositions, MacLean prefers to create a matrix of different natural sights and sounds. In his poem 'Ceòl' ('Music'), these are presented as inferior to the surpassing beauty of the music of spiritual activity. This composition, very consciously crafted, offers its own rich internal melody of rhyme and assonance, the cohesive repetition of key words and phrases, and a change of perspective at precisely its mid-point:

Ceòl[38]
Music

'S binn caoirean nan caochan an aonach nam beann,
Nuair tha 'n latha a' sgaoileadh air aodann nan gleann;
'S binn osna na gaoithe, 's gur aobhach a toirm,
Air ciùineadh don doininn, 's air cadal don stoirm.

Sweet the murmur of streams on the slopes of the bens,
When daylight is spreading on the face of the glens;
Sweet the sigh of the wind, and joyful its noise,
When the tempest has stilled, and the storm is asleep.

'S binn co-sheirm na coille, nan doire, 's nan stùc,
'S ro-ghasda an ceòl e san òg-mhadainn dhriùchd;
O, 's taitneach ra chluinntinn geum laoigh tighinn on chrò,
'S binn gàirich na tuinne, is bàirich nam bò!

Sweet the chorus of the forest, the groves, and the peaks,
A most splendid music in the early morning of dew;
O, how pleasant to hear the calf's cry from the fold!
How sweet the wave's laughter, and the lowing of cows!

'S binn naidheachd air caraid chaidh fada air chuairt,
'S cha seirbhe guth leannain dh'fhàs banail is suairc;
'S ro-blasda guth màthar làn blàiths agus gaoil –
Mar cheòl iad nach àlainn, nach càirdeil, nach caomh?

How sweet to have news of a friend who has travelled afar,
And, no less, the voice of a sweetheart grown womanly, kind;
How very sweet the voice of a mother full of warmth and love –
As music are these not beautiful, tender and dear?

[38] MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 49.

Ach tha ceòl ann as uaisle na bhuadhaibh gu mòr,
'S tha fuaim ann as binne 's as grinn' air gach dòigh;
Tha pongan as mìls' ann nach dìobair gu sìor
Gach ceòl rinn thu sòlasach an ear no an iar.

But there is a melody much more noble in quality,
And a sound more pleasant and sweeter in every way;
There are notes more melodious that will never forsake
The music that [truly] cheered you in east or in west.

Nach milis mar cheòl e, nach bòidheach, nach binn,
Guth chlag madainn Dòmhnaich, nach sònraichte grinn?
Na fuinn ud ro-àlainn tha fàilteach' an lò
A bheannaich an t-Àrd-rìgh gu slàinte nan slògh?

Isn't the voice of a bell on a Sunday morning
A sweet music, beautiful, tuneful and especially fine?
[And] those very lovely tunes that welcome the day
That the High King ordained, the people to save?

Nach binn a' chruit-chiùil ud, nach rùnach gach iall,
An cridhe trom brùite ag ùrnaigh ri Dia?
Nach taitneach mar cheòl e, nach bòidheach 's nach caoin,
Guth a mholaidh, a shòlais, a dhòchais, a ghaoil?

Isn't this [also] a sweet harp, and desirable in every way,
The bruised burdened heart engaged in praying to God?
Isn't this [too] pleasant music, both beautiful and gentle,
The voice singing his praise, his joy, his hope and his love?

This was a theme which MacLean pursued similarly in 'Latha 'n Tighearna' ('The Lord's Day').[39] There he rejoices in the quietness of the Sabbath, broken only by the hearty notes of the lark, the robin, and the thrush, and the appropriately melodious singing of worshippers who have glimpsed the glory of God. At day's end, all creatures retire to rest, leaving a pervasive silence, perhaps occasionally interrupted by the soft sighs of the wind in the foliage, the gentle sound of the streams, and the sweet music of a religious song or hymn.

[39] MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 50-52.

THE CYCLE OF THE SEASONS

Although MacLean often focuses on particular themes with a selection of images carrying a specific meditative or exhortatory message, he also presents his word-pictures within wider reflections on the changing seasons. Doubtless influenced by Dugald Buchanan's poem, 'An Geamhradh' ('Winter'), and also by the rich legacy of eighteenth-century Gaelic verse describing the seasons of the year, most notably in the poems of Alexander MacDonald, he depicted death as the ultimate winter, but with the prospect of renewal:[40]

Speuran gruamach, gaothaibh fuaimneach,
Sranna nuas o chruach nam beann,
Loch is fuaran, 's alltan luaineach,
Nan lic fhuar gun fhuaim, gun chainnt;
Theich am breac gu làr na linne,
Theich am fiadh gu srath nan gleann;
Uan no meann chan eil ri mireag,
Cuach cha ghoir an coill' no crann.

Gloomy skies and noisy winds
Rumble down from mountain tops;
Loch and spring, and meandering stream,
Are cold, soundless, voiceless slabs;
The trout has fled to the pool's bottom,
The deer has fled to the glens and strath;
No lamb or kid are sporting,
No cuckoo calls from wood or tree.

Feuch eòin an t-slèibh 's an cinn fo sgèith
Gam falach fèin an còs nam bruach,
A' ghrian neo-shùnndach mu èirigh,
Ach na leum gu dol na shuain;
Bàs na bliadhna leinn ge cianail,
Cha chùis iargain e no bròin;
Bheir grian an àigh is dealta blàth
Gach nì gu 'n àbhaist is gu 'n nòs.

See the birds of the moor, their heads under their wings,
Hiding themselves in the nooks of the banks,
The sun unenthusiastic about rising,
But eagerly hastening to go to sleep;
Though the death of the year should be sad to us,

[40] MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 56-60.

It is no reason for yearning or sorrow;
The sun of splendour and warm dew
Will restore everything to its accustomed habit.

A similar perspective, with appropriately sun-filled imagery, empowers MacLean's celebration of the preaching of the Gospel in the Highlands and Islands. In his song on 'Craobh-sgaoileadh an t-Soisgeil am Mòrthir agus Eileanan na Gàidhealtachd' ('The Proclamation of the Gospel on the Mainland and in the Islands of the Gàidhealtachd'), he states:[41]

Ach nis on dheàlraich caomh ghrian an àigh oirnn,
Thig latha 's fheàrr oirnn le blàths is sìth;
Thig solas uaipe a sheòlas suas sinn
Le blàths a dh'fhuadaicheas fuachd on chrìdh';
Bidh 'n cridhe seachdte, an cridhe meata,
An cridh' a chleachd bhith gun neart, gun chlì,
Mar chraobh san t-samhradh air triall don gheamhradh,
Le meas nach gann oirr', 's chan fhann a brìgh.

But now, since the kind sun of splendour has shone upon us,
We will enjoy a better day with warmth and peace;
It will radiate light which will guide us upwards
With a warmth which will banish coldness from the heart;
The withered heart, the fearful, timid heart,
The heart which was wont to be without strength or energy,
Will be like a tree in summer, following winter's departure,
With fruit unstinted, and with powerful pith.

MacLean clearly revelled in the resurrecting powers of spring and summer, which he celebrates further in 'Latha Bealltainn' ('May Day', literally 'The Day of Beltane')[42] and 'An t-Earrach' ('Spring').[43] In the former, he pictures the musical and physical delights of the season, and addresses May Day, using the Gaelic adjectival technique (in *-ach*) characteristic of the seasonal verse of Alexander MacDonald, and similarly conveying jocular enjoyment:

Ceud fàilte ort, a Bhealltainn aobhach!
[A] Bhealltainn shnodhach, bhliochdach, ghaolach,
Mhineineach, uanach, laoghach,
A' mireag air gach làimh is taobh dhinn.

41 MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 38-41.
42 MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 105-07.
43 MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 108-10.

A hundred welcomes to you, joyous May Day!
May Day, full of shoots, milky, much-loved,
Kid-adorned, lamb-adorned, calf-adorned,
Sporting on our every side and hand!

In the latter, the 'awakening' of spring is portrayed as releasing the locks and restrictions imposed by winter. So it can be with the soil of the indifferent soul, however hard, and however much in bondage in its current state. MacLean's vignette of the ploughman is particularly memorable:

Tha 'n treabhaich' a' dùsgadh gu sùnndach 's gu moch,
Le chaib' às [a] lèin' dhol a reubadh nan cnoc;
Chaidh an t-seisreach an òrdugh 's gur bòidheach don t-sùil
Na th' aige san amharc an dòchas 's an dùil.

The ploughman wakes early, filled with good cheer,
With spade in hand, and sleeves rolled up, to tear open the hills;
The plough-team has been set in order, and it is a delight to the eye
[To see] what he proposes to do with hope and intent.

Tha 'n sgrìob air a leagadh gu dìreach 's gu rèidh,
An sìol air a chur 's a chliath air a dhèidh,
'S is sùnndach is ceòlmhor an t-òran 's na fuinn
Tha tighinn ad chòdhail 'n àm treabhadh an fhuinn.

The furrow has been laid smoothly and straight,
The seed has been sown, and the harrow follows behind,
And how tuneful and cheery to hear the song and the airs
Which come to meet you at the time of ploughing the soil!

In this instance, however, MacLean may have drawn inspiration and ideas from James Thomson's poem on 'Spring', which offers a similar picture of the husbandman, setting his team to the plough:[44]

Forth fly the tepid airs; and unconfined,
Unbinding earth, the moving softness strays.
Joyous the impatient husbandman perceives
Relenting Nature, and his lusty steers
Drives from their stalls to where the well-used plough
Lies in the furrow loosened from the frost.
There, unrefusing, to the harnessed yoke

[44] Sambrook, *Seasons*, 4.

They lend their shoulder, and begin their toil,
Cheered by the simple song and soaring lark.

TREES AND BRANCHES

Images of nature are prominent in MacLean's two elegies, the one on the death of Thomas Chalmers and other ministers from the Disruption era,[45] and the other on his own daughter, Margaret.[46] In the former, MacLean shows his intimate knowledge of the time-honoured code of similes and metaphors which was integral to formal Gaelic eulogies and elegies. These were commonly centred on the tree, and especially the oak, which was the standard image of the clan chief in secular tradition. Thus, Chalmers' death is likened to the felling of the finest of trees, the apple-tree (representing beauty) and the oak (representing strength), in the context of a landslide:

Thuit abhall a' ghàrraidh
'S an darag a b' àirde sa choill';
Le osag an fhàsaich
Ghrad spadadh gu làr i le maoim.

The apple-tree of the garden has fallen,
And the tallest oak in the wood;
By the gust of the wilderness
It was suddenly struck down by a landslide.

Chalmers is further compared to the eagle in the breadth and height of his knowledge of the works of God and his study of astronomy:

Mar fhìor-eun na h-ealtainn
A' dìreadh am broilleach na grèin'.
Leis an t-sùil a bha beachdail
A' dearcadh air maise nan speur.

Like the true bird [i.e., eagle] of the bird-flock,
Ascending in the bosom of the sun,
With the ever-observant eye
Gazing at the beauty of the skies.

[45] MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 11-26. For discussion of the various ministers commemorated by MacLean, see Norman Campbell, 'Gaelic Lament'.

[46] MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 111-12.

The metaphor of the tree and its branches is integral to MacLean's deeply moving lament for his daughter Margaret, who died in 1863, evidently in childbirth, as described poignantly in the poem –

Bu chràiteach, goirt an sealladh d' athar
Bhith gur faicinn taisgte còmhla
An leabaidh chaoil maraon nur laighe
Le lèin' anairt oirbh mar chòmhdach.

It was painfully sore for your father to see
You both gathered together
In a narrow bed lying with one another
With a sheet of linen over you as a cover.

This experience of God's *slat* ('chastening-rod') made him weary and sad:

Rinn e briseadh air mo choille,
Gheàrr e meangan a bha nòsar;
Fhuair mi 'n droch an àit' an deagh sgeul
Dh'fhàgas èisleanach rim bheò mi.

It caused a breach within my forest,
It cut a branch that was pleasant;
I received bad news instead of good,
Which will leave me sorrowful all my days.

His hope was in the cleansing power of the Saviour's well of salvation, in which his children were washed – *Ghlanadh sibh an uisg' an fhuarain* ('You were cleansed in the water of the spring'), water which could blot out sins, though they should be as plentiful as *duilleach air na geugaibh* ('foliage on the branches').

HEAVENLY PROSPECTS

While drawing extensively on the images of earth, MacLean was clear that they were no substitute for the glory of Christ or the anticipated beauties of heaven. In 'An Crìosdaidh air Leabaidh a Bhàis' ('The Christian on his Deathbed'), the dying Christian speaks:[47]

Soraidh leat, a shaoghail,
Ni'n caoineam idir thu,
Ged bu mhòr mo ghaol ort

[47] MacLean, *Gaelic Poems*, 33-35.

'S ge b' aobhach leam do ghnùis;
Bha uair, ach rinn i caochladh,
Bha d' aogas is do dhealbh
Am bheachd ro mhaiseach, ghaolach,
Ach chaochail i is dh'fhalbh.

Farewell to you, world,
I will not weep for you at all,
Though once I loved you greatly,
And your face was sweet to me;
There was a time, now altered.
When your appearance and your form
Were to me both dear and beautiful,
But that has changed and gone.

Àd thobraichean a b' ùrar,
Àd shruthaibh siùbhlach, dian,
Do dh'òl mi cridheil, sùnndach,
Car ùine mar mo mhiann;
'S ge blasda leam mar bhùrn e
'S ge b' ùrar e dom bheul,
Do tharraing mi dom ionnsaigh
A' ghrùid mar aon ris fhèin.

From your wells that were refreshing,
From your swift and surging streams,
I drank heartily and gladly
For a while just as I wished;
Yet, though I thought the water tasty,
And refreshing to my mouth,
I sucked towards myself
The dregs that went with it,

A bheanntaidh corrach, àrda,
A ghleanntaidh àlainn, gorm,
Soraidh agus slàn leibh –
Tha tràth dhomh nis bhith falbh,
'S ged sgàilear sibh om shùilean
Le ceathach dùmhail bàis,
Cha tuir mi sibh 's chan ionndrainn –
Tha 'm fhradharc dùthaich as fheàrr.

High and sharp-peaked mountains,
Glens so fine and green,
Farewell and goodbye to you –

It is now my time to part!
And though you will be shaded
From my eyes by death's thick mist.
I'll not lament or miss you –
A better country fills my sight.

Nevertheless, MacLean's picture of heaven is of a land which incorporates, in an everlasting context, all the most appealing features of his own natural Highland environment, and excludes the less pleasant:[48]

Tìr an àigh, a' ghràidh 's a' choibhneis,
Tìr tha ghnàth gu soilleir, soillseach;
Tìr nam beannachd, tìr an aoibhneis,
Gun fheum air solus grèin no coinnle.

Land of splendour, love and kindness,
Land that's always bright and shining;
Land of blessings, land of rejoicing,
With no need for light of sun or candle.

Tìr nam fonn nach caill am mìlseachd,
Tìr nan òran de nach sgìthich,
Tìr a' chiùil nach sguir gu dìlinn,
Tìr nan aingeal is nam fìrean.

Land of tunes that never lose their sweetness,
Land of songs of which none will weary,
Land of the music that lasts eternally,
Land of angels and the righteous.

Tìr nan crann nach caill an àilleachd,
Gorm is ùrar bhios gu bràth iad;
Croinn len duilleach a bheir slàinte,
Tìr nan aibhnichean nach fàilnich.

Land of trees which will not lose their beauty,
Remaining green and fresh for ever;
Trees whose leaves deliver salvation,
Land of rivers that are unfailing.

Tìr an t-samhraidh chaoidh a mhaireas,
Tìr gun fhuar-dhealt, gun chlach-mheallainn;

[48] MacLean, *Gaelic Hymns*, 107.

Tìr gun osna, deur, no smalan,
Gun fhuachd geamhraidh no tart earraich.

Land of summer that endures unending,
Land without cold dew, with no hailstones;
Land without sighing, tears or sadness,
Without winter's frost or drought of springtime.

Nach sona iadsan a gheibh còir oirre'!
Feitheamh orr' tha uallach glòire,
Tobraichean tha làn de shòlas –
Mar ri Dia gu sìor an còmhnaidh.

How happy those who will possess it!
Awaiting them is a weight of glory,
Wells that are full of gladness –
Their residence is with God for ever.

CONCLUDING OVERVIEW

Duncan MacLean's output is notable within the wider body of Gaelic spiritual verse for its extensive and consistent use of imagery drawn from the natural world. As he was self-evidently a well-read scholar, his technique is a confluence of several streams which he has used skilfully to empower his poetic mill. The principal feeder-stream is clearly the strong Gaelic tradition of poetry in praise of nature which was the hallmark of the major secular poets of the eighteenth century, most notably Alexander MacDonald and Duncan MacIntyre. Another stream, smaller but no less potent, was contributed by the religious verse of Dugald Buchanan, who was likewise indebted to Gaelic secular models for his use of natural imagery. The range of Buchanan's verse was more restricted, and less revealing of the self than MacLean's, as it was closer to eighteenth-century neo-classical models which did not so readily convey the composer's emotions.

A generation later, MacLean's verse is noticeably more personal in its keynotes than Buchanan's. He was familiar with the moods of Macpherson's 'Ossian', and he probably drew some inspirational water from James Thomson's *Seasons* and the works of English hymn-writers of the so-called Romantic period. Like the output of these composers, MacLean's verse contains an element of more personal reflection, but his intimate familiarity with his own rural context and with previous Gaelic verse models helps him to maintain a firm focus on visual, tactile, and realistic vignettes. In these and in more extensive single-image metaphors,

he utilises the hills and glens, flora and fauna of his native Perthshire as an illustrative and reinforcing picture-board for his spiritual reflections. Nevertheless, he avoids parochialism in his sense of place, with the result that his verse could be understood easily by readers and hearers throughout the wider Highlands and Islands.

MacLean's interaction with the physical world is thus not only more extensive than that of most other Gaelic religious poets, but it is also much more sympathetic and affirmative. While depicting transience, mortality and accountability, he avoids the predominant emphasis on earthly futility and the final judgement, which looms large in Buchanan and many of his post-1800 successors. For MacLean's contemporary, the Rev. Peter Grant (c. 1783-1867) of Strathspey, for example, the physical environment was largely a fleeting, fragile, and temporary stage on the believer's journey to the heavenly city, a 'vale of tears' strewn with thistles and snares, a constant struggle with the world, the flesh and the Devil, offering little or nothing of lasting value.[49] MacLean's enjoyment of his natural surroundings is very obvious, but he is careful to give pre-eminence to the next life and to people's spiritual needs, thus avoiding any hint of deism, pantheism or similar forms of belief which were fashionable among English poets of the Romantic era.

It is evident that MacLean's verse is carefully crafted, reflecting a conscious attempt to produce good-quality poetry, initially for a literary journal, rather than versification which acted solely as a vehicle for a sermon or an exhortation. This may be one of the reasons that his work has been lost in the later twentieth century, as the evangelical constituency of the Highlands and Islands has shown an overriding preference for less 'literary' verse, which, somewhat predictably, privileges spiritual experience and emotion over literary creativity. It is also highly likely that the loss of MacLean's distinctive voice has been hastened by the demise of Gaelic in his native Perthshire, and by a wider failure to appreciate the central importance of that region to the development of Gaelic literature.

Although MacLean's verse has almost disappeared from present-day awareness, it was highly regarded in his own time, and even in 1922 his 'religious poems' were considered to be 'second only to those of Dugald Buchanan and John Morrison, of Harris'.[50] It is to be hoped that, while avoiding any such rankings within a putative and pointless 'league table', the present study will help to restore the Rev. Duncan MacLean to wider attention as a significant Gaelic religious poet, and also as a noteworthy literary artist of nineteenth-century Scotland.

---

49 Meek, 'The Glory of the Lamb', 148-49.

50 *Oban Times*, 25 March 1922.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Teachdaire Gae'lach. Gaelic periodical, 1829-31.

ATG: see *An Teachdaire Gae'lach.*

(The) Brechin Advertiser, 1848-2021.

Campbell, Norman, 'A Gaelic lament for Thomas Chalmers', *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal*, 12 (2022).

Fulford, Tim, ed., *The Collected Hymns of Henry Kirke White*. Liverpool University Press, 2024.

GH: see MacLean, D., *Gaelic Hymns.*

(The) Inverness Advertiser, 1860-82.

Kidd, Sheila M., 'Early Gaelic periodicals: knowledge transfer and impact', in *Rannsachadh na Gàidhlig*, 6, ed. C. Ó Baoill and N. McGuire. An Clò Gàidhealach, 2013.

Lauder, Thomas Dick, *An Account of the Great Floods of August 1829 in the Province of Moray and Adjoining Districts.* R. Stewart, 1830.

MacLean, Duncan, 'The Parish of Glenurchy & Inishail', in *The New Statistical Account of Scotland*, Vol. 7 (Argyle section). William Blackwood and Sons, 1845.

MacLean, D., *Cumha an Diadhair Urramaich Dr Thomas Chalmers a chaochail anns a' bhliadhna 1847 agus Dà Dhàn Spioradail Eile.* Duncan Macvean, 1848.

MacLean, D., *Gaelic Hymns: Laoidhean agus Dàin le Donnachadh MacGilleadhain, Ministeir na h-Eaglais Saoire ann an Gleannurchaidh.* G. Mac-na-Ceardadh, 1868.

Meek, Donald E., 'The Glory of the Lamb: The Gaelic Hymns of Peter Grant' in Bebbington, D. W., ed., *The Gospel in the World: International Baptist Studies.* Paternoster Press, 2002.

Meek, Donald E., ed., *Caran an t-Saoghail: The Wiles of the World: Anthology of 19th Century Scottish Gaelic Verse.* Birlinn Publishers, 2003.

Meek, Donald E., 'The Sublime Gael: The Impact of MacPherson's *Ossian* on Literary Creativity and Cultural Perception in Gaelic Scotland', in Howard Gaskill, ed., *The Reception of Ossian in Europe*. Thoemmes, Continuum, 2004.

Meek, Donald E., 'Gaelic Literature in the Nineteenth Century', in *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature*, Volume 2, ed. Susan Manning et al. Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Meek, Donald E., 'Evangelicalism, Ossianism and the Enlightenment: the many masks of Dugald Buchanan', in *Crossing the Highland Line: Cross-currents in Eighteenth-century Scottish Writing*, ed. Christopher MacLachlan. Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 2009.

Meek, Donald E., *Dugald Buchanan (1716-68): the poet, the translator, and the manuscript evidence*. The Canna Lecture 2016. Scottish Gaelic Texts Society, 2019.

(The) Oban Times, 1861 to the present.

OPR: Old Parochial Registers. *Scotlands People*, https://www.scotlandspeople.gov.uk

Sambrook, James, ed., *The Seasons and The Castle of Indolence by James Thomson*. Oxford University Press, 1987.

Thomson, Derick S., ed. and transl., *Gaelic Poetry in the Eighteenth Century: A Bilingual Anthology*. The Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 1993.

Thomson, R. L., ed., *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh: John Carswell's Gaelic translation of the Book of Common Order*. Oliver & Boyd, for the Scottish Gaelic Texts Society, 1970.

Watson, J. R., *The English Hymn: A Critical and Historical Study*. Oxford University Press, 1997.

The Covenanters' Contribution to the Revolution in Scotland, 1688–90

Rev. Dr Alasdair J Macleod, Lecturer in Church History, Highland Theological College UHI.

based on Address at the HTC Church History Conference, Dingwall, 30 April 2024.

ABSTRACT: In 1689, the deposition of James VII created a constitutional crisis in Scotland, with a major civil war threatened between the Williamites and the Jacobites. The Covenanters were active at this crucial stage in support of the accession of William and Mary to the throne of Scotland, and were instrumental in securing the achievement of this Revolution without major bloodshed. The great majority of Covenanters supported the resulting Revolution Settlement of the Church of Scotland as Presbyterian. Only a small minority of hardline Covenanters stood outside the Kirk after 1690.

INTRODUCTION

In early January of 1689, the news spread to the furthest ends of Scotland that the King had fled from London. The Roman Catholic King James, II of England and Ireland, VII of Scotland, escaped at the end of December 1688 to the Continent, as the Dutch army of the Protestant Prince William of Orange and his English wife Princess Mary occupied the capital without bloodshed. It was an extraordinary turnaround: a true revolution. Less than a year before, on 17 February 1688, the Covenanting minister James Renwick had been hanged at the Grassmarket in Edinburgh for just the same crime: he declared that James Stewart was not the rightful king. For five years, Renwick had preached against the policies and rule of James in the fields and in private homes throughout the south of Scotland, repeatedly escaping from the troops sent to apprehend him. At last, he had been caught, and had faced death fearlessly on a charge of high treason against the King. The monarch's power seemed – indeed was – absolute: James dominated the established Church of Scotland through his chosen bishops, and the Scottish state through an appointed Privy Council, and was openly working to secure the toleration of Roman Catholicism. When the Parliaments of England and Scotland had resisted his policies, James suspended their sittings, and ruled by decree. For the Covenanters, the very future of the Protestant Reformation in Scotland looked to be in question.

This article contends that the Covenanters contributed to the successful achievement of the Glorious Revolution in Scotland, whereby William and Mary acceded to the Scottish crown without significant bloodshed. Not only were the Covenanters active in their support for the new monarchs, they also largely supported and participated in the institutions of William and Mary's reign, the national Church above all. The article will discuss the Covenanters in their identity and standing under James VII; the situation in 1688; the progress of revolution during 1689, and particularly the Covenanter contribution to it; and the conclusion of the Revolution settlement of the Church of Scotland in 1690.

I. THE COVENANTERS

The Covenanters were those Scottish Protestants who were committed to Reformed theology and Presbyterian church government, and desired reform of the Church along these lines. Their commitment had famously been enshrined in the National Covenant signed in Greyfriars Kirkyard in 1638, and they had dominated both church and state in Scotland in the years that followed. However, they had been left divided and gravely weakened by the disputes of the succeeding decades, by conquest by Oliver Cromwell and the English Army in the 1650s, and by the relentless persecution of the Stewart monarchs since the Restoration of 1660. Some who had signed the Covenant had conformed to the Episcopalian settlement imposed on the Scottish Church by Charles II. The remainder had endured the Great Ejection of 1662, whereby their ministers were excluded from the Church for their Presbyterian principles and forbidden to preach. Yet even this group were divided: some of the ministers and congregations accepted indulgences in the years that followed, which permitted them to minister legally according to Presbyterian form under certain restrictions; others viewed these ministers as having sold out their principles and considered it vital to stand apart from them. Some of the remaining Covenanters ministered illegally at covert field gatherings; others waited quietly for a better day or retreated into exile on the Continent.

The most radical of the Covenanters, the United Societies, rejected entirely the legitimacy of the rule of the Stewart kings as monarchs in breach of the Covenant and preached armed rebellion on that basis – and entire separation from those who disagreed, whether Episcopalians or more moderate Presbyterians. Richard Cameron was the first to articulate this position, in the Sanquhar Declaration in 1680, but the other ministers of the United Societies maintained the same convictions. Each met a violent end successively: Cameron was killed in battle later in 1680; Donald

Cargill was hanged in Edinburgh in 1681; and Renwick in 1688. This left the United Societies with just three young ministers at the time of the Revolution: Thomas Linning, Alexander Shields, and William Boyd.

As a result of their radicalism in challenging James's right to the crown, and their willingness to carry arms in defiance of the authorities, the United Societies were the object of particular concern for the Scottish Privy Council. While James VII's legal tolerance was extended even to Roman Catholic services, the United Societies remained banned from worship, and people were subject to the severest civil penalties if they were found to have attended field meetings of the Societies.

Even Covenanters not associated with the Societies were still in danger of persecution, where their ministry seemed to challenge in any way the settled religious order under James VII. One victim was the former minister of Inverness, Angus Macbean, who had been ordained as an Episcopalian, and after a brief pastorate in Ayr had been called to the first charge of Inverness. There he was much appreciated and admired as a preacher of Protestantism, known for denouncing Roman Catholicism. But he became increasingly disillusioned with the corrupt Episcopalian government of the Church of Scotland, and in 1687 he withdrew from the Establishment, and began to minister in private houses to those who would gather to hear him in Inverness and elsewhere. This led to his arrest, interrogation by the Privy Council in Edinburgh, deposition from the ministry, and imprisonment in the Tolbooth. There he remained for most of the year 1688, and by the time deliverance came, his health had broken, and he died shortly afterwards, yet another martyr for the Covenanting cause, though he had no connection to the United Societies.[1]

II. THE SITUATION IN 1688

James looked unassailable, but in fact his authority was fragile. Two crucial events in the year 1688 served to undermine his reign. The first was the birth of a son, James Francis Edward on 10 June, to James and his Italian wife Mary of Modena. This was a shocking development, as James's marriage had been childless for eleven years. Unlike his older half-sisters, this child would be raised in the Roman Catholicism of his parents, and as a male held precedence in the line of succession from birth. This birth thus brought the prospect of a permanent Roman Catholic dynasty ruling Britain. James's Romanism could no longer be considered a private matter.

[1] Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1926), vi, 456–7.

The second event that undermined James was the legal case fought over the Declaration of Indulgence. This Declaration, which James issued in 1687, granted freedom of worship to dissenters. While the Declaration extended to both Catholics and Protestants, all knew that the King's purpose was to promote the advance of Roman Catholicism. When he re-issued it in 1688, James demanded that it be read in every Anglican church. The result was a protest from seven bishops of the Church of England against the Declaration, to whom the prospect of open toleration of Romanism was obnoxious. James brought an ill-advised prosecution for seditious libel against the bishops for publishing their protest. The case was politically disastrous for James, arousing great sympathy for the bishops, who were eventually acquitted on 30 June 1688. The hasty prosecution destroyed James's authority.

That very same day, an invitation was sent to William of Orange signed by seven leading individuals in the English Church and state, inviting him to take the throne of England. When William landed at Torbay in Devon on 5 November, he was greeted with relief on all sides, and entered London without bloodshed. As James escaped abroad, it seemed that the kingdom of England agreed with the martyred Renwick that he was not the rightful king. Yet it should be acknowledged that the immediate developments of 1688 owed nothing to the Covenanters or indeed to Scotland. It was not the Cameronian opposition that swept James from power but opposition rather from those Protestants whom the Covenanters most despised, the supposedly quiescent conformists of the Church of England, who turned out to be more zealous than many expected when it seemed that the Reformation itself was under threat. In its immediate accomplishment, the Glorious Revolution was an Anglican achievement.

In Scotland, the Lord Chancellor, the Roman Catholic Earl of Perth, a ruthless persecutor of Renwick and the other Covenanters, fled from Edinburgh after being assaulted by a mob in December 1688. The crowd smashed up the Catholic chapel at Holyroodhouse where the King and his favourites had reintroduced Mass, and where the Jesuits had set up schools and a printing press. The books, beads, crosses, and images were burnt in the streets. Lord Perth was captured shortly afterwards, trying to flee on board a ship to the Continent dressed as a woman, and was confined in the common prison in Kirkcaldy.

Scotland was therefore without a King, and without a Lord Chancellor, creating a situation fraught with both possibility and danger. It was far from clear what would happen next. William could become King of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, but this was by no means a certainty. Furthermore, James would presumably seek to regain

his crown, and would certainly call on his Scottish allies to fight for him. The nation seemed on the brink of a new Civil War.

But for the Covenanters, the Presbyterians of Scotland, it was a glorious moment. They had survived the 'Killing Times', now the persecuting King, who had threatened to bring the British Isles back under the heel of the Papacy, had fled. On 25 December members of the United Societies proclaimed their support for the 'Protestant Protector' William of Orange and his 'Declaration to the People of Scotland' in Glasgow. This was led by the Cameronian preacher William Boyd and was probably the first public response to the Declaration. Willliam's declaration to the Scottish people on 10 October 1688 had spoken explicitly of the persecution in Scotland in recalling the destruction of 'the poor people' 'by hanging, shooting and drowning them, without any form of law or respect to sex or age'.[2] Such sympathetic rhetoric was clearly intended to appeal to the Covenanters of Scotland and enlist their support. The Cameronian response suggested that William's words had received a ready response, though Matthew Vogan has cautioned that not all in the United Societies supported William Boyd's proclamation at Glasgow.[3] Boyd had previously lived in Holland, where, according to the Fasti, 'he enjoyed the friendship and confidence of William, Prince of Orange', which may help to explain the speed and enthusiasm of his welcome for William.[4]

III. THE DEVELOPMENTS OF 1689

On 4 January 1689, the United Societies gathered for worship at Douglas, Lanarkshire: their minister, Alexander Shields, expounded Psalm 76, 'In Judah's land, God is well known, / his name's in Isr'el great'. The context of the Psalm, the thanksgiving for God's deliverance of His people, appeared very apt. In expounding the psalm, Shields recalled that it had been 'sweetly sung by famous Mr. Robert Bruce at the Cross of Edinburgh' when news was received of the defeat of the Spanish Armada one hundred years before.[5] The comparison was clear: God had judged and averted a Roman Catholic plan of conquest in 1588, and in 1688 he had done the same again through the coming of William and Mary. For the Covenanters, the English-born James was the foreign oppressor, while the

2 Quoted in Matthew Vogan, 'Alexander Shields, the Revolution Settlement and the Unity of the Visible Church' (109-146), *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal*, 2 (2012), 113–14.

3 Vogan, 'Alexander Shields', 114.

4 Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, ii, 408.

5 Quoted in Vogan, 'Alexander Shields', 116.

Dutch prince was their deliverer, and by implication, an agent of God's judgment.

An uneasy peace continued through the early months of 1689, as all sides waited for the news from England. On 13 February, William and Mary jointly accepted the crown of England from the English Parliament, and a Convention of the Estates of Scotland, which would effectively function as a Scottish Parliament, was summoned for 14 March.

Meanwhile, on 2 March, the United Societies gathered in vast numbers at Lesmahagow and renewed the National Covenant, and Solemn League and Covenant, amongst solemn scenes of mourning over past sins, and earnest dedication of themselves to be faithful to the Lord. Shields preached from Deuteronomy 26:16: 'This day the LORD thy God hath commanded thee to do these statutes and judgments: thou shalt therefore keep and do them with all thine heart, and with all thy soul'. The Societies had never hesitated to bear arms at their meetings, and it was now clear that their military strength was considerable – especially in their heartlands in the South West. The Covenanters' position was clear: they stood with William and Mary and would fight for them if necessary.

The Convention of Estates thus gathered in a very tense situation, under a real threat of Civil War. The Duke of Gordon still held Edinburgh Castle for James, and its batteries were trained on Parliament House. The Jacobite peers Lord Balcarres and the bloody persecutor of the Covenanters, John Graham of Claverhouse, now ennobled as Viscount Dundee, both attended with letters of authority from the exiled King. The nine Scottish bishops, who were of a different stamp from the English bishops, and entirely dependent on James's choice and support for their promotion, took their seats as well. The Convention's first duty was to elect a President, and William's candidate was the Duke of Hamilton, Scotland's pre-eminent peer. The Marquess of Atholl opposed him as the candidate of the Jacobite party. However, it must be emphasized that these noblemen were opportunistic politicians rather than true partisans. Astonishingly, in both cases, their sons were also members of the Convention, and in both cases the sons joined the opposing party to their fathers, as the noble families blatantly hedged their bets!

The vote was taken, and Hamilton gained the Presidency. The Williamites had their first victory. Next came the reading of the letters from the two rival sovereigns. On a vote, it was agreed to take William's letter first, which was a typically cautious and conciliatory document. Then James's letter was read, and was typical of all the failings of the Stewart kings: standing on the royal prerogatives, threatening charges of treason against those who opposed him, it proved deeply damaging to James's cause. As the historian William Ferguson observed:

> This alarmed the waverers among the Episcopalians who feared that in the event of James's restoration their natural allegiance would be made to cover not just the King's majesty but also the spiritual claims of the Pope. Rightly, this episode has been regarded as the main determinant of the course followed by the convention. [...] At a stroke, his stupid letter reduced James' active sympathisers in the estates to a relatively small body of committed Jacobites of whom the chief was Viscount Dundee.[6]

After these initial discussions, it was clear that few other than the bishops were determined partisans for James. Crucially, the leaders of the Episcopalian Church were thus left marginalised, the supporters of a discredited King, while those of even moderate Presbyterian sympathies were firmly allied to William of Orange. With little prospect of success, Claverhouse abandoned the Convention and headed north to raise a Jacobite army in the Highlands. The Jacobites in the Convention were therefore left few and leaderless, and William's supporters had their way all the more easily.

On 4 April, the Convention declared the throne of Scotland vacant. By his misrule, James was deemed to have forfeited the crown – a vindication, just a year later, of James Renwick's position by the very authorities that had executed him. That same day, the United Societies paraded with arms in the Grassmarket, in a show of military strength in defiance of the Jacobites. On 11 April, the Convention formally determined to offer the crown of Scotland jointly to William and Mary. The terms of the offer were enacted in the Claim of Right, a hugely important piece of constitutional legislation, which rejected the supremacy that the Stewart kings had claimed over the rule of law, and limited the power of the monarch over Parliament. It condemned episcopacy as 'a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this Nation and contrary to the Inclinationes of the generality of the people ever since the reformatione' and called for it to be abolished.[7] With the bishops of the Scottish Church still supportive of James, there was no way for the Williamites to secure the crown in Scotland except by siding with the Presbyterians.

With the prospect of conflict drawing nearer, the Covenanters of the United Societies were ready to take arms in defence of William's kingship and the Claim of Right. That same month, the Earl of Angus raised a regiment of 1200 Covenanters, called the Cameronians in memory of their martyred minister Richard Cameron, to fight for William. Remarkably, the minister who had been abominated as a notorious traitor by the Scottish authorities for the preceding decade was now lending his name to a regiment defending the organs of the state. The Cameronians had

---

6 William Ferguson, *Scotland, 1689 to the Present* (Edinburgh, 1968), 3.

7 'Claim of Right', 1689, URL: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aosp/1689/28

not produced the Glorious Revolution, but were willingly enlisted in its support.

On 11 May, William accepted the terms of the Claim of Right, with the provision only that he was not going to be a religious persecutor. Scotland had a new King and Queen, and a Presbyterian settlement was in sight. With the crown settled, a full Scottish Parliament met, and rapidly began to reform the Scottish Church: on 26 May, the Westminster Confession of Faith was approved as the Confession of Faith of the Scottish Church, restoring the Confession that had been used in the Church between 1647 and 1661, during the high water mark of Covenanter domination of the Kirk. On 22 July, episcopacy was formally abolished.

Meanwhile, the Jacobites were divided. Atholl acquiesced, and wrote to William to assure him of his allegiance. Gordon surrendered Edinburgh Castle, and Balcarres submitted to imprisonment. But Dundee had gathered his forces in the Highlands, and began to advance south. The long-brewing conflict at last erupted on 27 July, at the Battle of Killiecrankie in Perthshire, where the Highland Jacobites won a rapid victory over the Williamite forces under General Hugh Mackay of Scourie. But it was a hollow win, as Claverhouse himself was mortally wounded during the fight. The Jacobites in Scotland were victorious, but effectively leaderless.

The situation was now dangerous, with a victorious Jacobite army heading south. The Scottish Privy Council prepared to leave Scotland, and ordered the new Cameronian Regiment to Dunkeld, with orders to hold back the Jacobite advance at all costs. On 21 August, an army of 5000 Highland Jacobites assailed Dunkeld. The Cameronians had just 800 men in the field, and Dunkeld offered little protection, having no city wall. The Cameronians therefore took up their positions in the Cathedral and in the mansion of Lord Atholl.

The Jacobites attacked from all sides. The Cameronian Colonel was killed in the first hour, and the major was wounded, so it fell to a mere captain, George Munro, to lead the defence. For sixteen hours, the battle went on. At last the Cameronians were stripping the lead off the roof of Atholl House to make musket balls, yet they kept firing. At 11 o'clock that night, the exhausted Jacobites, out of ammunition, at last withdrew, and began to retreat north – the town, and the south of Scotland, had been held for William. The Cameronians had won the victory. The Revolution and the Protestant royal succession would both have been seriously endangered without the Cameronian defence of the Parliament and the victory at Dunkeld which, in Ian Cowan's assessment, 'secured the

protestant revolution in Scotland'.[8] The Cameronian regiment thereafter remained a permanent part of the British Army, in service to William and Mary and their successors.

IV. THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT, 1690

In the latter part of 1689 and throughout 1690, the process of reform continued at a local level. In the Covenanting heartlands, the Episcopalian curates were ejected from their churches and manses. Though there was an element of retribution, it was a not reverse persecution: no one was killed or tortured. By law, ministers were obliged to pray for William and Mary, and those who refused could lawfully be deprived of their charges. By 7 November 1689, 182 curates had been dispossessed for this reason. Throughout Scotland, Presbyterianism was associated with loyalty to William, Episcopacy with support for James. Consequently, many ordained to their parishes according to Episcopalian order now professed conversion to Presbyterian principles and loyalty to the Kirk going forwards. The Scottish Parliament passed an 'Act ratifying the Confession of Faith and settling presbyterian church government' on 7 June 1690, confirming the Presbyterian settlement of the Kirk, which by that stage was inevitable.[9]

As appointed by that Act, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland finally met in October and November of 1690, the first General Assembly to meet in Scotland since 1653. It was a gathering of elderly ministers, as under the terms of the Act its ministerial membership was drawn exclusively from the Presbyterian survivors of the Great Ejection of 1662. Thomas Hog, minister of Kiltearn, by then a frail 62-year-old, was typical of its membership. It would be for this body to decide whom to admit and whom not to admit to the Kirk going forward, as clearly it was not for the civil authorities to weigh the merits of the various Episcopalian claimants to Presbyterian conversion. In practice, the Church showed a generally conciliatory attitude to Episcopalians, with those professing conversion to Presbyterian principles rapidly admitted, and even those who remained stubbornly loyal to episcopacy generally left in their charges, provided only that they were willing to take the oaths of allegiance and assurance of loyalty to William and Mary as rightful

[8] Ian B. Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters: 1660-1688* (London, 1976), p.144.

[9] Act ratifying the Confession of Faith and settling presbyterian church government, 1690, URL: https://www.rps.ac.uk/search.php?a=fcf&fn=william_and_mary_trans&id=49704&t=trans

King and Queen.[10] Crucially, the 1690 Assembly agreed to admit the three young ministers from the United Societies, and all three went into ministry within the Kirk: Boyd as parish minister of Dalry; Linning of Lesmahagow; and Shields as chaplain to the Cameronian regiment. This decision did much to conciliate the remnants of the United Societies.

Ultimately, only about one third of the Societies' membership determined to remain separate from Church and state.[11] Far from being the sole remaining Covenanters, those who remained outside the Revolution Church were only the most extreme edge of the movement, a minority of the United Societies, which were in turn just a minority of the Covenanter movement. These groups lacked unity among themselves, becoming known generally, as Vogan has observed, by the names of their most prominent leaders, 'Adamites, Harlites, Howdenites, etc.' The Hamiltonians, followers of Sir Robert Hamilton, were the first formally to repudiate the authority of William and Mary, by a second Sanquhar Declaration in 1692, though their subsequent conduct made clear that they had no intention of attempting an armed uprising.[12]

CONCLUSION

It is thus not accurate to contend that the Covenanters declined to enter the Revolution Church. In fact, the Covenanters *were* the Revolution Church. The Assembly of 1690 was composed of those who had ministered in covenanted Presbyterianism prior to the Great Ejection, and it was these ministers, and their associated elders, who guarded the orthodoxy and determined the extent of the charity to be dispensed in admitting applicants of Episcopal ordination to the ministry. Even when the focus lies strictly upon the United Societies, it is evident that the majority entered the Revolution Church, led by the Societies' ministers, and supported not only the accession of William and Mary but also the institutions of their rule, such as the Parliament and the Army. Indeed, William and Mary owed a very specific debt to the Cameronian regiment, recruited from the supporters of the United Societies, for their heroic defence of Dunkeld in 1689, an action that helped to safeguard the Williamite succession and ultimate Presbyterian settlement in Scotland.

The key point of difference, which divided the United Societies, was ultimately very simple – those who entered the Kirk accepted the limitations of the possible. They recognized that it was not possible to impose

[10] J. H. S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1960), 263–5.
[11] Vogan, 'Alexander Shields', 130.
[12] Vogan, 'Alexander Shields', 116.

the Covenants on William and Mary, or a Presbyterian settlement upon England. A Presbyterian settlement for Scotland upon the basis of the Westminster Confession was the most that could be achieved, and was viewed by most of the Covenanter remnant as a fulfilment of the National Covenant's pledge to pursue reformation in the Kirk.

"Every Minister Ought To Know That Book": John McLeod Campbell And The Nature Of The Atonement

Dr Nick Needham

John McLeod Campbell is a name to conjure with in Scottish theology. Arguably he was 19th century Scotland's most original and influential thinker on the doctrine of the work of Christ. When T. F. Torrance, Scotland's most internationally respected theologian of the 20th century, wrote his history of Scottish theology, he entitled the work *Scottish Theology: From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell*, as if Campbell brought the whole theological history of Scotland to its finality and maturity. Of course, many would dispute that assessment.

Even so, there is no doubting the seminal character of Campbell's 1856 treatise *The Nature of the Atonement*. R. S. Franks, in his magisterial *History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ*, described Campbell's book as the most systematic and masterly volume produced by a British theologian on the work of Christ during the whole of the nineteenth century. The great Congregationalist theologian P. T. Forsyth once said, "I hope you have read McLeod Campbell on the Atonement. Every minister ought to know that book, and know it well… [A] great, fine, holy book."[1] Forsyth went on to offer some criticism of Campbell's masterwork, but in the context of acknowledging its enduring significance and value.

Certainly, Campbell's *Nature of the Atonement* has become a classic in Scottish theological history. It has always been a provocative work. Some have resoundingly rejected it: I guess the great majority of Westminster Calvinists fall into that category. Some have accepted its key arguments: see for example C. S. Lewis's treatment of the atonement in *Mere Christianity*, the chapter entitled *The Perfect Penitent*, a thoroughly McLeod Campbellian account of Christ's atoning work. Some have appropriated it selectively, building on some of its views but critiquing others (P. T. Forsyth fell into this category). Who, then, was John McLeod Campbell? And what was it that inspired the writing of his highly stimulating *magnum opus*?

John McLeod Campbell was born in 1800 at Armaddy House, near Oban, Argyllshire: so there is the Highland connection, which of course we also discern in the Campbell name. He was the eldest son of the Rev

---

1 P. T. Forsyth, *The Work of Christ*, ch.5 "The Cross the Great Confessional", at https://ccel.org/ccel/forsyth/work/work.vii.html accessed 14.10.2024

Donald Campbell, a Church of Scotland minister. Campbell senior was a widower, so that his son grew up without the abiding influence of a mother. The period 1811 to 1820 saw the young Campbell studying at Glasgow University with a view to following his father into the Church of Scotland ministry. As well as becoming competent in Latin and Hebrew, he also discovered the fascinations of natural beauty, and read Byron and Shakespeare with enthusiasm.

Having completed his divinity course, Campbell then spent the winter of 1820-21 at Edinburgh University; and it was at this point that he received a call from the Church of Scotland congregation in Hatton Garden, London, Edward Irving's future charge. This was one of those odd coincidences that pointed the way towards Campbell's embrace within Irving's circle, which included Irving himself, Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, Robert Story of Rosneath, and Alexander J. Scott.

The call to Hatton Garden failed to actualise, however, and Campbell had to wait another four years before being inducted to his first pastorate. He filled up the time by studying Jonathan Edwards' *Treatise on Religious Affections*, the Scottish "common sense" philosophers such as Thomas Reid, and in particular Bishop Joseph Butler's *Analogy of Religion*, the most celebrated British response to the Enlightenment religion of Deism. He also read *The Force of Truth*, the spiritual autobiography of the Anglican Calvinist clergyman and commentator Thomas Scott, and was influenced thereby in an Evangelical direction. In 1824, Campbell openly declared his personal faith in the merits of Christ as the sole source of salvation. This was a significant step, as his father belonged to the non-Evangelical Moderate party within the Scottish Church. Prior to Campbell's acceptance of Evangelicalism, he had (he later confessed) been a disciple of the latitudinarian Archbishop Tillotson.

At last, in May 1825, Campbell was presented by the Duke of Argyll to the Church of Scotland congregation at Row, and inducted to the charge in the September of that year.[2] The parish of Row was on the eastern shore of the Gareloch in Dunbartonshire. Opposite Row on the western side of the Gareloch stood the parish of Rosneath, whose minister Robert Story had been the fellow student of Edward Irving at Edinburgh University. Story and Campbell became intimate friends. Below both Row and Rosneath, on the south side of the Clyde, stood Port Glasgow, which was to assume a poignant significance when the future controversy around Campbell entered its charismatic phase.

---

[2] Row was at that time spelt as printed but pronounced "Rhu". Later the spelling was changed to Rhu to reflect the pronunciation.

According to his own account, Campbell began his ministry with a somewhat elementary theology. He claimed that at the outset of his ministry at Row, the only doctrines that were "realities in my mind" were "the fact of an Atonement and the necessity of regeneration."[3] He could not subsequently remember what, if anything, he believed at that time about the extent of the atonement. "As to Election, I was content to hold it simply as a matter of fact, and to excuse myself for not considering it much by regarding it as a mystery..."[4] He determined that he would maintain "a perfect neutrality" in respect to the Evangelical and Moderate parties in the Scottish national Church, and to read the Bible alone in preparing his sermons, consulting commentaries only for linguistic and never for theological purposes.[5]

Campbell's troubles soon began. To his dismay, he found over his first year that his preaching was manifestly failing to produce the desired effect among his congregation. This sterility he traced to a prevailing legalistic mentality:

> I came to see that, in reality, whatever I preached, they were only hearing a *demand* on them to be – not hearing the Divine secret of the Gospel as to *how* to be – that which they were called to be. Of this they themselves had no suspicion; they said, and honestly, that they did not question Christ's power to save, neither did they doubt the freeness of the Gospel or Christ's willingness to save them; all their doubts were as to themselves... In this mind the Gospel was practically a law, and the call to trust in Christ only an addition to the demand which the law makes – an additional duty added to the obligation to love God and to love man, not the secret of the power to love God and to love man.[6]

Campbell's parishioners felt that they were not entitled to draw near to Christ without the warrant of some perceived goodness of their own. A barrier of spiritual introspection was thus erected between themselves and trusting Christ. Campbell's solution to this problem was straightforward:

> Seeing this clearly, my labour was to fix their attention on the love of God revealed in Christ, and to get them into the mental attitude of looking at God

---

3 John McLeod Campbell, *Reminiscences and Reflections referring to his early ministry in the Parish of Row, 1825-31* (London 1973) p.11.

4 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* p.11.

5 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* pp.11-12.

6 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* pp.132-3.

> to learn His feelings towards them, not at themselves to consider their feelings towards Him…[7]
>
> I was gradually taught to see that so long as the individual is uncertain of being the subject of love to his God, and is still without any sure hold of his personal safety in the prospect of eternity, it is in vain to attempt to induce him to serve God under the power of any purer motive than the desire to win God's love for himself, and so to secure his own happiness... And thus I was gradually led to entertain the doctrine commonly expressed by the words 'Assurance of Faith'.[8]

He hoped his proclamation of the assurance of God's grace would bring his people "under the natural power of the love, the forgiving, redeeming love which was set before them" in the gospel, thus begetting that joyful confidence in Christ which until now had eluded their grasp.[9] From the autumn of 1826, the assurance of God's forgiveness in Christ for sinners thus became Campbell's great theme.

Interestingly, Campbell denies that Calvinism was the cause of the legalistic and doubt-ridden attitudes he was trying to change.

> Those who are familiar with our Scottish theology, and know how early it is taught to our children, may, perhaps, be inclined to trace to Calvinistic preconceptions the difficulty found in endeavouring to lead these earnest minds to look simply at the discovery of the mind of God towards sinful man, which He has made who came to reveal the Father. I do not remember that it was so... What I met with in the earnest minds to which I refer was different. It was a difficulty in rising to the conception of free grace – that is, to the apprehension of a love in God to us which is irrespective of what we are, and is sustained by the contemplation of what He both wills us to be and is able to make us.[10]

This is an important point. Although the train of Campbell's thought was ultimately to carry him beyond Calvinism, we have his mature reflection that Calvinism as such was not the original problem. The problem was the innate legalism of the human heart.

Campbell's view that one could not love or serve God without first being assured of one's "personal safety in the prospect of eternity" led him to a fateful conviction. He became convinced that a faith not characterised by this assurance was incapable of producing love for God, and therefore was not true faith at all. This brought him into direct conflict with

---

7 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* p.133.
8 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* p.18.
9 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* p.133.
10 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* p.133-4.

the widespread view that assurance of salvation was to be derived from the spirituality of one's life as proof of the reality of one's faith. Campbell insisted against this that if one's sense of peace with God depended on one's perceived sanctification, this was *de facto* justification by works. True faith was self-authenticating:

> the light of life is its own protection. He that so knows himself and Christ in the light of Christ has the witness in himself... Fruits of faith are, indeed, given as a test to be applied to the professions of others, or – it may be – to the doctrine they teach. But how can our own faith be thus tested? We may, and we should, so test what we are called to believe; and we must have evidence of its tendency before submitting to it, or accepting it as of God. But to ask me to stand in suspense as to my trust in Christ – whether it is a right and saving trust – making this depend on the consciousness of fruits of holiness in myself – this is really to suspend trust – that is, to suspend faith – until I am conscious of the effects of faith: a process which, if intelligently followed, obviously makes fruits of faith impossible.[11]

The system of assurance by evidences of holiness, Campbell felt, led only to despair.

This, then, was the character of Campbell's preaching from autumn 1826 until roughly the autumn of 1827. Thus far, no public antagonism was generated, except that some of Campbell's parishioners complained that he "carried the subject of assurance too far".[12] Yet in that complaint lay the origins of the coming storm.

It was in September 1827 that Campbell became acquainted with the intellectually brilliant Alexander John Scott, soon to be Edward Irving's pastoral assistant. Scott, having just been licensed to preach, conducted a Sunday service for Campbell at Row. Campbell was deeply taken with his new friend. Scott at this juncture was a sort of four-point Calvinist or Amyraldian in his view of the extent of the atonement, accepting its universality, and was not shy in communicating it. As his biographer Philip Newell points out, it could well have been the freshly felt influence of the impressive and articulate Scott which prompted Campbell to move towards a belief in universal atonement, as the basis of that assurance of divine love to sinners which was now the burden of his message.[13]

We have Campbell's own testimony about his progress from the assurance of faith to universal atonement. He traces it to the opposition to his preaching of assurance which he began to encounter from traditionally

---

11 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* p.138-9.

12 Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* p.19.

13 Philip Newell, *A.J.Scott and his Circle* (PhD Edinburgh 1981) pp.38-9.

minded Calvinist ministers in the closing months of 1827, by which time his views were becoming more widely known. Campbell's account is clear:

> The controversy in which I was [from now on] constantly engaged in almost all my intercourse with my [ministerial] brethren urged me to examine narrowly the foundation furnished by the communications made in the Gospel for Assurance of Faith. This led directly to the closer consideration of the extent of the Atonement, and the circumstances in which mankind had been placed by the shedding of the blood of Christ; and it soon appeared manifest that unless Christ had died for all, and unless the Gospel announced Him as the gift of God to every human being, so that there remained nothing to be done to give the individual a title to rejoice in Christ as his own Saviour, there was no foundation in the record of God for the Assurance which I demanded, and which I saw to be essential to true holiness. The next step therefore was my teaching, as the subject-matter of the Gospel, Universal Atonement and Pardon through the blood of Christ.[14]

Campbell, then, by the beginning of 1828, had moved towards a belief that all humanity had been placed in an objective state of pardon through Christ's universal atoning death, so that this simply had to be believed in order to produce love for God and subjective salvation. Campbell could not have foreseen that three long, bitter years of controversy lay ahead of him, a controversy that would be carried up to the highest authority in his Church, its General Assembly, and result in his being deposed from the ministry.

The controversy that engulfed Campbell from 1828 to 1831 was complex and explosive. It swept up into its fury not only Campbell, but a number of other leading figures in the Scottish Church, all of whom were perceived as challenging the Westminster Confession. These others included Alexander John Scott, Edward Irving, Robert Story, Hugh Baillie Maclean, the lay theologian Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, and indeed others. Almost all of these who held ministerial rank ended up being deposed or resigning.

It is difficult to explain the reactionary zeal that seemed to convulse the Church of Scotland's General Assembly in 1831, when Evangelicals and non-Evangelicals combined to cast out Campbell and others. One would not be exaggerating much to compare the 1831 Assembly to a French Revolutionary Committee of Public Safety, dispatching one person after another to the guillotine. Probably contributing to the reactionary purge was a revulsion against the charismatic or Pentecostal movement that had sprung up in Port Glasgow in 1830, and had (one way or another)

[14] Campell, *Reminiscences and Reflections* p.24.

touched Campbell, Scott, Irving, Erskine, and others. This movement was the seedbed of the Catholic Apostolic Church, popularly nicknamed Irvingism: a High Church liturgical and sacramental Pentecostalism that foreshadowed the actual Pentecostal movement of the 1900s.

The human drama at Campbell's trial for heresy was intense. Campbell's father made a moving plea on behalf of his son at the Assembly:

> I can say that I never heard any preacher more earnestly and powerfully recommending holiness of heart and life. It was certainly what I never expected, that a motion for his immediate deposition should have come from my old friend, Dr Cook; but I do not stand here to deprecate your wrath. I bow to any decision to which you may think it right to come. Moderator, I am not afraid for my son; though his brethren cast him out, the Master whom he serves will not forsake him; and while I live, I will never be ashamed to be the father of so holy and blameless a son.[15]

Even some Evangelicals were opposed to taking disciplinary action against Campbell, notably Thomas Chalmers, the leader of the Evangelical party in the Scottish Church. But Chalmers' generosity was not shared by the majority, and he found himself thwarted in his cautious opposition to the reactionary Assembly. The hearings dragged on all through the night to the following morning. When the vote was taken, there were only 125 Assembly members present out of a total of some 300, the rest having sensibly retired to their beds. 119 voted for Campbell's deposition, and six for his suspension.

Prior to the official pronouncement of the sentence of deposition, a disagreement as to the order of procedure occurred, during which the chief clerk of the Assembly, Dr MacKnight of Edinburgh, declared – or meant to declare – that the Church of Scotland would remain and flourish long after the doctrines of McLeod Campbell had perished and were forgotten. Unhappily, Dr MacKnight mixed up his words, and was heard to say, "These doctrines of Mr Campbell will remain and flourish after the Church of Scotland has perished and is forgotten."

At which point, Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, who had watched the day's proceedings with a pained and disconsolate spirit, turned and whispered to those sitting behind him, "This spake he not of himself, but being high priest, he prophesied."[16]

So it was that at quarter past six in the morning, on Wednesday 25th May 1831, John McLeod Campbell found himself deposed from the min-

---

15 R. H. Story, *Memoir of the Life of the Rev Robert Story* (London 1862) p.178.

16 William Hanna, *Letters of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen* (2 volumes, Edinburgh 1877) vol.1 p.137.

istry of the Church of Scotland by its supreme court. Some Evangelicals who had not attended that very late session were shocked by the outcome when they turned up for the next meeting of Assembly. Thomas Chalmers in particular was disappointed, commenting that if a window could be opened up into the ex-pastor of Row's breast, it would be seen how little he had differed from his brethren. Chalmers' view was that Campbell was "in conduct irreproachable – in doctrine unexceptionable – but in language rash".[17]

The majority in the Assembly, however, remained in a fierce mood, and went on to depose both Alexander Scott and Hugh Baillie Maclean, and to take the first steps toward deposing Edward Irving. Probably Robert Story of Rosneath, the bosom friend of Campbell, would also have been deposed, had he not held back from using Campbell's "rash language" on the disputed topics.

The ongoing life and ministry of Campbell post-1831 are lacking in huge interest, until he published his ground-breaking work on the atonement in 1856. The two years immediately following his deposition saw him as an evangelist in the Scottish Highlands. In 1833, he became the pastor of an independent congregation in Glasgow, in a church building especially constructed for him and those who appreciated his preaching. He was invited to minister alongside his friend Edward Irving in the Catholic Apostolic Church, but preferred to keep his distance from the Pentecostalism of the new denomination. During his own trial and deposition, Irving spoke out passionately on behalf of Campbell as a martyr for truth, whom Irving was privileged to follow out into the ecclesiastical wilderness.

> The greatest gift ever bestowed on the people of Scotland since the days of Knox – yea, a greater than he – I mean John Campbell – has been cast out. He was a spotless man of God. In him was no fault – albeit no fault that man could lay to his charge. He was a godly man. But him ye have cast out with scorn; and shall I not take his part – shall I not receive him to my bosom? – because in receiving him I receive Christ.[18]

And so we come to McLeod Campbell's 1856 treatise on *The Nature of the Atonement and its Relation to the Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*. After his deposition from the Church of Scotland ministry for teaching that Christ's death had, in some sense, situated mankind in an objective state of pardon, which (personally appropriated) produced individual sal-

[17] Story, *Memoir of Rev Robert Story* p.175 (note).

[18] Margaret Oliphant, *The Life of Edward Irving* (2 volumes, London 1862), vol.2 p,348.

vation, Campbell had continued to reflect on the meaning of the atonement. At length he put down his mature thoughts, twenty-five years after the original atonement controversy. This time, he focused on the nature rather than the extent of the atonement. He took his cue from a conjecture offered by Jonathan Edwards: perhaps a surprising source, but we remember the early influence of Edwards on a young McLeod Campbell.

Edwards once expressed the opinion that, if only fallen man had been capable of giving to God a perfect repentance for his sin, such repentance would have sufficed to restore him to a right relationship with God.[19] Campbell built on this conception, setting forth a doctrine of Christ's death as an act of vicarious repentance and confession. On Man's behalf, as Man's representative, Christ the Second Adam, the True Man, renders to His heavenly Father a perfect confession of human sin, and a perfect repentance for it. Christ thereby, for our sakes and in our name, does for us what we, corrupted by sin, could never do for ourselves.

We should not be misled by the word repentance here into thinking that Campbell believed Christ had any personal sin requiring personal repentance. Campbell instead was conceiving of repentance in the sense of a heartfelt acknowledgment of humanity's sin, a holy sorrow over it, and a humble submission to God's judgment upon it, all enacted perfectly on humanity's behalf by Him who was the living Head of the human race. This view of the nature of the atonement had in fact already been articulated by Campbell's friend Thomas Erskine, in his 1831 treatise *The Brazen Serpent*. But Erskine's book (to be frank) had been long-winded, turgid, and muddled up with premillennial speculations and a full-blown Irvingite Christology (that Christ had a fallen nature), which had robbed the book of its impact. Campbell's book by contrast is a comparatively clear, systematic, focused, and theologically well-framed account of the ideas he shared with Erskine. It was therefore Campbell's 1856 treatise, rather than Erskine's treatise of 1831, that burst like a flaming meteor in the sky of British theology.

Campbell insisted that one must not bring any preconceptions to a study of the atonement. In other words, we should not approach the matter with a preconceived idea of what an atonement must be. Rather, one must seek to grasp the reality of the atonement in its own light. The key question, Campbell says, is what the atonement was intended to accomplish, which we learn from the atonement itself. His answer to the question: it was intended to bring God and Man together. But who is God and what is Man? Campbell argues from what he takes to be New Testa-

[19] This is in Edwards' *Remarks on Important Theological Controversies*, ch,5, 'Of Satisfaction for Sin'.

ment Christology that God is not primarily a legal Master, with Man as His slave or bondservant, but primarily a loving Father with Man as His created child. In Campbell's words, "our relation to God as our righteous Lord is subordinate to our relation to Him as the Father of our spirits, the original and root-relation, in the light of which alone all God's dealings with us can be understood."[20]

The atonement is thus grounded, not in a context of law, but in God's Fatherhood: a father's desire to reclaim his lost and erring children. The heavenly Father does not need to be conditioned into forgiving; His willingness to forgive is as eternal as His fatherly nature. The question is how sinful Man can be effectually brought to the Father so as to receive and enjoy His forgiveness. This was the purpose of His work in and through the Incarnate Son.

Campbell seeks to explain the atoning work of Christ under two broad headings, what he calls its retrospective and prospective aspects – how it deals with our past (what we are saved *from*), and how it deals with our future (what we are saved *for*). Under each of these aspects, Campbell considers Christ as dealing with Man on God's behalf, and dealing with God on Man's behalf. This, too, he sees as truth contained in, and shining from, the atonement itself, rather than a preconceived framework imposed upon it.

Let us see what Campbell teaches about the retrospective side of the atonement (what it saves us *from*). How did Christ deal with Man on God's behalf? In and through the sinless perfection of His humanity, He revealed the nature of God's will as perfect and holy love towards men. This revelation involved Christ in suffering, and it reached its culmination on the cross. Everything Christ did and suffered was part of His bearing witness of God's love for humanity. Integral to this revealed love in Christ's life and death is God's holy grief over human sin. This enables us to see sin as God sees it.

What about Christ's dealing with God on Man's behalf? This is where Campbell teaches that Christ, as the Representative Man, fully and completely confessed Man's sin to God. Famously he states that Christ's acknowledgment of Man's sin was "a perfect Amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man".[21] The Spirit of the risen Christ now unites us with Christ's Amen to God's holy rejection of sin, so that it is echoed in our own hearts. This is our personal repentance.

We might have thought that Campbell would soft-pedal biblical teaching on God's wrath. It is, however, clearly present in his view of the atone-

---

[20] John McLeod Campbell, *The Nature of the Atonement* (London 1867) p.339.

[21] Campbell, *Atonement* p.136.

ment; he says that Christ's vicarious confession of human sin involved a total submission to God's judgment against it, and that this confession and submission "absorbed" God's holy wrath. Campbell does, therefore, give a significant place to God's wrath against sin, but differs from the traditional Evangelical view in affirming that this wrath has been dealt with by Christ's vicarious confession, rather than by penal substitution. The atonement is thus objective and effective but not penal in character.

In his section on the prospective aspect of the atonement (what it saves us *for*), Campbell emphasizes that its purpose is to restore Man to God, so that men become what God always meant them to be. Speaking purely personally, although I by no means accept everything that Campbell teaches, I always found his strong accent on what the atonement saves us *for* to be rich and helpful. I think we too often dwell one-sidedly and negatively on what the atonement saves us *from*. But as Campbell points out, the Bible is replete with teaching on the positive blessings that flow from the atonement. It brings us to God (1 Peter 3:18). It sanctifies us (Ephesians 5:25-27). It embraces us into eternal life (John 3:15-16). It is the source of the gift of the Spirit (Galatians 3:13-14). In short, the positive purpose and outcome of the atonement is to transform us into the perfect humanity that was both embodied and made known in Christ.

In expounding the prospective side of the atonement, Campbell again distinguishes between Christ dealing with Man on God's behalf, and dealing with God on Man's behalf. He deals with Man on God's behalf by manifesting the Father, thereby enabling men to enter into true fellowship with Him. The very incarnation of the Son of God demonstrates God's fatherly mind and heart towards humanity, His infinite and costly desire to reclaim us as His children. By knowing who and what Christ is, we discover what Man is intended to be and is capable of becoming.

Christ's dealing with God on Man's behalf in the prospective side of the atonement lies in His consecrating human nature to God as God's child. The Son of God incorporates manhood into His Sonship, and thinks, feels, acts, and lives toward God as a loving, trusting, obedient child. This empowers Him to catch us up, so to speak, into His filial manhood, so that in Him we become God's children, sharing in His Sonship to the Father. Campbell goes so far as to say that Christ's instilling the spirit of sonship into us, so that we commune through Him with God as Father, constitutes the finest fruit and perfection of His atoning work.

Campbell's treatise expresses some strong critiques of the High Calvinism that dominated Evangelical theology in his native Scotland. He especially critiqued the doctrine of limited atonement or particular redemption, on the grounds that it necessarily and catastrophically undermined Christ's manifestation of the Father's love for all human-

ity. He was also less than satisfied by the so-called Moderate Calvinism associated in Scotland with the pre-eminent Congregationalist theologian Ralph Wardlaw, and in England with the innovative Baptist thinker Andrew Fuller. Moderate Calvinism accepted the universality of the atonement. But Campbell's dissatisfaction here was motivated by what he perceived as Moderate Calvinism's excessively legal, governmental vision of the atonement and its consequences, in contrast to the filial and familial conception so dear to Campbell's heart.

The Nature of the Atonement is certainly one of the most brilliant and original works of theology in Scottish church history. In that respect, it is a true classic. No less a figure than B. B. Warfield (a stalwart defender of traditional Calvinism) spoke appreciatively of Campbell's treatise, as at least vindicating the objectivity of the atonement, by virtue of its insistence that Christ did something for us in relation to God (vicarious confession and repentance) that we could not do for ourselves. This view, says Warfield, was "set forth in his remarkably attractive way by John McLeod Campbell" among others (Warfield mentions the eminent Anglican theologian R. C. Moberly as another).[22]

Even the critics of Campbell's *magnum opus* were often moved to acknowledge that an authentic sense of spirituality and holiness pervades the book, quickening the reader's piety, even when failing to command his intellectual assent. I may be forgiven for quoting Thomas Hywel Hughes on this feature of Campbell's work, since he gives voice to it so eloquently. (Hughes was the Principal of the Scottish Congregational College and examiner in divinity at London University). The quotation is from Hughes' *The Atonement: Modern Theories of the Doctrine*. He says:

> We are conscious that this [Campbell's book] is a fine spiritual treatment of the subject. Its influence on subsequent thought was very great in its liberating power… We can see on the surface the strong points of the theory. It commended itself to thinking men by its surrender of the extreme penal views held in Dr. Campbell's day, by its change from the legal and commercial basis of the older views to the personal and spiritual realm. Again its appeal to Christian experience in dealing with forgiveness and the other facts, made possible by the Atonement, rang true, and found an echo in the souls of men. Moreover, the fine devotional spirit with which the author approached his subject made the appeal of his book very powerful.[23]

---

[22] B. B. Warfield, 'Atonement' in *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, at https://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/sdg/warfield/warfield_atonement.html accessed 15.10.2024.

[23] Thomas Hywel Hughes, *The Atonement: Modern Theories of the Doctrine* (London 1949) p.145.

But even those, like Hughes, P. T. Forsyth, and H. R. Mackintosh, who saw heart-kindling piety and genuine theological value in Campbell's work, were not unwilling to express various reservations and criticisms. Allow me to mention two. Forsyth argued that in Campbell's doctrine of vicarious confession, he over-emphasised Christ's confession of Man's sin, and failed properly to set forth His confession of God's holiness. The heavenly Father is a holy Father; unless His holiness is recognised as central, and unless the atoning work of Christ is understood as glorifying the Father's holiness, the full and true meaning of the cross is not rightly appreciated.

A second criticism made by several theologians was that Campbell did not seem to make it entirely clear why precisely Christ's vicarious confession of Man's sin required His death. Campbell stresses that the precious element in the cross is not Christ's physical suffering in the abstract, but the spirit in which He underwent that suffering – His humility, obedience, trust, love, spiritual sorrow, and self-surrender. Without these, His mere bodily suffering by itself would have been without value. We can grant this. Yet still one wonders why this would strictly necessitate His death. On Campbell's assumptions, could Christ not perhaps have atoned for sin in the Garden of Gethsemane without actually dying? Some further significant theological ingredients appear to need adding into Campbell's framework, if the physical death of the incarnate Son is to be made fully intelligible.

Perhaps the missing ingredient is that Christ's confession of Man's sin, His vicarious acknowledgment of the judgment sin deserves, entails that He submit to physical death as an integral aspect of that confession and acknowledgment. After all, in the Bible, death is involved in God's holy judgment on sin. If so, we seem to be veering back into territory that incorporates some kind of penal element in the atonement, but one that emphasises not so much the *external suffering* of Jesus, but much more His *internal attitude* of submission to God's rejection of sin. "Righteous art Thou, O LORD, and upright are Thy judgments" (Psalm 119:137). "Thou art righteous, O Lord, because Thou hast judged thus" (Revelation 16:5).

Without this internal attitude on Jesus' part in our name – without this profoundly personal, moral, and spiritual acknowledgment of the sinfulness of sin and God's holiness in judging it – no atonement would have taken place on the cross. Christ as Representative Head offers to God *everything* that we owe; and we owe, not mere passive suffering, but an active and positive acknowledgment of our sin, and a subjective bowing to the holy judgment it deserves. If the Head does not offer these things

on our behalf, He has failed to give what we owe, and has therefore not rightly or fully atoned for sin.[24]

John McLeod Campbell will always have a special place in the ecclesiastical and theological history of Scotland. The earlier part of his life saw him intimately connected with the foremost creative innovators and spiritual influencers of the day – giants like Thomas Erskine, Edward Irving, and A. J. Scott. He also, we recollect, won the sympathy of the mighty Thomas Chalmers, who vainly threw his weight against the movement to depose Campbell from the Church of Scotland ministry. The later part of Campbell's life as a Congregationalist pastor in Glasgow was less exciting than those Springtime years of sound and fury, but it gave him sufficient leisure from the bitterness and distraction of controversy to be able to produce his masterwork on the atonement in 1856. There can be very few theological volumes that have extorted such praise from those who could not accept some of its most central teachings. It was reprinted as recently as 2022, and will probably go on being reprinted and studied for as long as the subject of the atonement still holds sway over the human mind.

[24] I therefore think it possible to draw together the best of McLeod Campbell's insights with a more traditional doctrine of penal substitutionary atonement. The more traditional doctrine, in my judgment, is entailed by such passages as Isaiah 53 and Galatians 3:13.

James Clerk Maxwell and the 1859 Aberdeen Revival[1]

Bruce Ritchie

In the year 1879, one great scientist died, and another was born. We know why Albert Einstein (1879-1955) is deemed a great scientist. But why is James Clerk Maxwell (1831-1879) also considered to be such? When Einstein was asked if he stood on Isaac Newton's shoulders, he replied: 'That statement is not quite right; I stood on Maxwell's shoulders.' Einstein also stated that, before Maxwell, people used to consider physical reality as a compilation of material points, whereas, after Maxwell, they conceived physical reality as represented by continuous fields. Einstein regarded this transformation in the conception of reality as the most profound change for physics since Isaac Newton. In other words, Maxwell fostered a totally new way of understanding the universe.

What did Maxwell achieve? He linked Light and Electromagnetism. He developed the notion of Field Theory in physics. He made science rethink the nature of reality, as a continuum. He set out the initial 'Maxwell Equations', which are fundamental to modern physics. (When Richard Feynman was asked in 1962 by the Californian Institute of Technology to present a course on the fundamentals of physics then, without hesitation, he started with Maxwell's equations.) Maxwell also did pioneer mathematical work on the Rings of Saturn, with his theories confirmed by satellite fly-pasts in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. He established the principles of the theory of colour;[2] and, along with his assistant Thomas Sutton (1819–1875), he produced the first colour image in photography. Maxwell's theoretical work provides the foundation not only for contemporary science, but for much of modern life.

A BRIEF BIOGRAPHY

James Clerk Maxwell was born at 14 India Street, Edinburgh, on the 13th of June 1831. A few weeks later an entry was made in the local Church of Scotland *Birth and Baptismal register*:

---

1 This article is based on: Bruce Ritchie, *James Clerk Maxwell: Faith, Church and Physics*, (Haddington: Handsel Press, 2024). It was presented as a paper to the 2024 Highland Theological College Scottish Church History Conference 'Outlanders for the Faith.'

2 Red, Green, Blue: rather than: Red, Yellow, Blue.

> John Clerk Maxwell of Middlebie esq., Advocate, and Mrs. Francis Cay his spouse, St. Stephen's Parish, a son born 13th June 1831, named James. Baptised 29th July 1831 by the Rev Dr David Ritchie.

After two years, the family moved to Glenlair estate, in the heart of Galloway, in the south-west region of Scotland. At Glenlair his mother gave him his early education, both general and spiritual. Later in life, Maxwell said that it was his mother who taught him to 'Look through nature to nature's God'. As a small child he wanted to know how things worked. Toddlers can exhaust parents and grandparents by constantly asking 'Why?', but he went one better. His repeated question was: 'What's the go' o' that?' In other words: why does it work the way it does?

In 1839, his mother died of cancer. Soon afterwards, the decision was made for him to attend Edinburgh Academy. During term-time he stayed with his father's sister, Aunt Isabella, at 31 Heriot Row. On James' opening day at school, he arrived with two problems! First, his father had designed his clothes! Second, he had a broad Gallovidian accent. He was immediately called 'dafty!', and though the 'dafty' nickname faded out, his Gallovidian accent never did.

During his years in Edinburgh, he attended St. Andrew's Church of Scotland, George Street, in the morning; and St. John's Episcopal Church, Princes Street, in the afternoon, with his Aunt Jane, who was his late mother's sister. In one he learned *The Shorter Catechism*. In the other he read Dean Ramsay's *Catechism for Young People*. At age fourteen his first paper was read to the Royal Society of Edinburgh. He was in Edinburgh at the time of the Disruption in 1843, with the schism taking place at the Church of Scotland General Assembly which was held in his family church of St. Andrew's. The Maxwells stayed in the 'Auld Kirk'.

After leaving school, Maxwell attended Edinburgh University, from 1847 to 1850, though as a non-graduating student. This left him free to audit various courses in chemistry, physics, mathematics, and philosophy. He loved the philosophy lectures given by Sir William Hamilton (1788-1856)—not to be confused with the later mathematician William Rowan Hamilton (1805-1865) whom Maxwell also knew. Though Sir William Hamilton, the philosopher, came from a family with an impeccable Covenanting pedigree, he was himself agnostic. Yet, though Maxwell and Sir William differed on faith, Maxwell drew heavily on Sir William's philosophy, with much of it impinging on Maxwell's overall view of science. Throughout his life Maxwell reflected on the philosophical and metaphysical questions which impinged on his science.

Maxwell went to Cambridge in 1850, graduating in 1854, and staying on for two additional years as a Fellow. Cambridge saw him go through a

crisis of some type in 1853. Some have interpreted it as Maxwell's conversion to a more evangelical faith. More probably, it was a crisis which deepened an already existing piety. During that time Maxwell also presented several creative papers to various societies and journals, including some of his initial work on light, electromagnetism, and field theory.

In 1856 he became Professor of Natural Philosophy at Marischal College, in Aberdeen. At that time Aberdeen had two Universities: one was Marischal College, the other was King's College. In Aberdeen his work on Saturn's Rings won him international acclaim. It was there that he also met and married Katherine Dewar (1824-1886), daughter of Daniel Dewar the Marischal Principal. Every morning, James and Katherine read the Bible together. Even when apart, Maxwell would write to her with his thoughts on the reading for that day, with his letters to Katherine giving insights into his Christ-centred faith. He stressed the Christian's union with Christ, and he wrote of knowledge of God coming through Christ.

In Maxwell's inaugural Professorial lecture, of November 1856, he stressed that the aim of a University should not be about becoming an academic conveyor-belt. Instead, it should be about enabling graduates to serve God in Church and State. Thus, at the very start of his professorial life, Maxwell set the study of science within a religious and civic context. Significantly, he was in Aberdeen during the Aberdeen religious revival of 1859, though we can refer to the period 1857 to 1860 as part of the Revival.

The two Aberdeen Universities fused in 1860. Maxwell was then appointed by King's College, London. During his time at King's, he further developed his electromagnetic theory. At all times Maxwell saw Michael Faraday (1791-1867) as an inspiration. Faraday was also a strong Christian, and it is arguable that Maxwell's greatest accomplishments were in extending Faraday's ideas and giving them mathematical rigour. It was as he reflected on Faraday's theories, that Maxwell realised that the nature of reality needed to be rethought. It needed to be seen, not in terms of individual particles as in Isaac Newton's thinking, but as continuous fields. It was this which Einstein had in mind when he said: 'Before Maxwell, people used to conceive physical reality as material points; whereas, after Maxwell, they conceived physical reality as represented by continuous fields.' Importantly, Maxwell always stressed that Faraday had pointed the way.

Maxwell's father died in 1856, making Maxwell Laird of the Glenlair Estate, just outside the village of Corsock, near Castle Douglas. After he resigned from London in 1865, he and Katherine spent the next six years at Glenlair. He was now free from academia and could write and think unencumbered by academic responsibilities.

As soon as Maxwell inherited Glenlair, he became a 'heritor'. This made him, along with others, responsible for maintaining and funding parish institutions including the kirk and the minister. In 1863, he was ordained an Elder of the Kirk in Corsock. When he was invited to become an elder, he knew that he was required to affirm *The Westminster Confession of Faith*. He had already read it, but he reread it very carefully before going forward for ordination to the eldership. He was a conscientious elder. He did his cottage visiting. He prayed with his parishioners. He was involved in discipline cases. In later years the Corsock folk remembered his pastoral visits with deep affection, especially his prayers. His minister was George Sturrock (1832-1902), who was also interested in science. On Sunday afternoons, Maxwell's habit was to read the great Puritan theologians such as John Owen and Jonathan Edwards.

Maxwell was also a poet and a hymn-writer. One of his hymns was '*The Student's Evening Hymn*', from which the following stanza is taken:

> Give me love aright to trace, Thine to everything created.
> Preaching to a ransomed race, by Thy mercy renovated.
> Till with all thy fulness sated, I behold thee face to face.
> And with ardour unabated, sing the glories of thy grace.

In 1871 Maxwell was enticed back to Cambridge, to teach Natural Philosophy and to set up a new research laboratory. The laboratory was later named the Cavendish Laboratory and would become internationally famous. Up to, and including, the year 2019, the Cavendish could boast of thirty Nobel Prize winners. And it was Maxwell who had the words of Psalm 111, following Miles Coverdale's sixteenth-century translation, engraved into the stonework of the Laboratory:

> The works of the Lord are great.
> They are pondered by all who delight in them.

James Clerk Maxwell died on the 5th of November 1879, aged 48. It was the same age his mother had been. It was the same type of cancer his mother had had. He was buried in Parton Kirkyard, a few miles from Glenlair House.

THE 1859 ABERDEEN REVIVAL

Though the Aberdeen Revival took place over several years, 1859 was a high-point. The same year also saw a major scientific forum taking place in the city. In September 1859, the *British Association for the Advancement*

of Science (*BAAS*) choose Aberdeen as the site for its annual meeting. The *Association* had been formed in in the 1830s by individuals who felt that existing institutions, such as the Royal Society, were too stuffy, too exclusive, and too London-centric. This new *Association* had a goal of inclusivity which included a determination to take major scientific conferences to every part of the United Kingdom and Ireland. Aberdeen was by far the farthest north they had yet ventured, and by 1859 every British scientist of note was a member of the *BAAS*, ranging from Clerk Maxwell to Charles Darwin, from David Brewster to Thomas Huxley, and from Michael Faraday to Thomas Murchison.

Aberdeen's newly refurbished Music Hall, seating 2,000, was the scene of the *Association's* opening meeting. This was addressed by no less a personage than Albert, the Prince Consort, and husband of Queen Victoria. He was the honorary president of the *Association* that year, and he delivered a significant speech in which he stressed that advance in every area of human knowledge—but especially the sciences—depended on an open democracy, rather than elitism. In a memorable phrase, Prince Albert emphasised that advancement in the sciences came, not through a process akin to 'the action of the monarchy of a paternal Government, but the republican activity of the Roman Forum'.

At the *British Association* meetings, Maxwell was busy and active. Not only did he present several scientific papers, but he was heavily involved in the organising of the event. The whole conference was a great success.

A month or so later, and in the same Music Hall which had welcomed Prince Albert, a quite different event took place. It was connected to the wave of religious revival which had started in Ulster and was now impacting Scotland, especially Aberdeen and the north-east. The revivalist preacher Charles Finney (1792–1875) had come from the United States to take part in this spiritual movement. The Aberdeen Music Hall was one of his venues, as announced by the *Aberdeen Press & Journal*:

> The Rev. C. G. Finney, a Professor in Oberlin College, Ohio, United States, a noted preacher, is at present on visit to Aberdeen. He preached in the Evangelical Union Church (Rev. F. Ferguson's), St. Paul Street, on Sabbath afternoon and evening, and again last night, and is again to preach to-day, and on Thursday and Friday evenings. Mr Finney's style is plain, familiar, and direct. He has had a large number of hearers. Mr Finney's meeting this evening … takes place in the Music Hall.[3]

Finney did not initiate revivalism in Aberdeenshire. That had started at least a year earlier, as a result of the inauguration of revival-seeking

[3] *Aberdeen Press & Journal*, 16 Nov 1859.

prayer-meetings. Various evangelistic campaigns had already begun in the city, featuring invited preachers such as Grattan Guinness (1835–1910), Brownlow North (1810–1875), and Reginald Radcliffe (1825–1895), all of whom addressed vast gatherings.

Kenneth Jeffrey's book, *When the Lord Walked the Land*, focuses on the Aberdeen revivals.[4] Jeffrey points out that the movement exhibited distinctive characteristics in different areas. The city reaction was different from that of the farming interior, which in turn was different from that of the seaports. Jeffrey noted that meetings in the fishing villages could be highly emotional, whereas congregations elsewhere were extremely orderly. He suggests that this contrast may have arisen because the fishing village services were conducted apart from the established churches, whose ministers tended to try and ensure that emotionalism did not surface.

James Clerk Maxwell was interested in the revival, and we will review the evidence for that in due course. We do not know if Maxwell went to Charles Finney's event in the Music Hall, but he may well have. In our opinion, he almost certainly would have: the meeting took place within term-time; Daniel Dewar, his own father-in-law was intensely interested; and several of Maxwell's fellow academics and personal friends were deeply involved in the movement.

1. William Martin

One such friend was William Martin (1816–1890). Martin was Marischal's Professor of Moral Philosophy.[5] After Maxwell arrived in Aberdeen, he and Martin were regular companions on daily walks until Martin became unwell.[6] Martin was intensely evangelical. He saw his professorial position as an opportunity to influence students spiritually. Having been a parish minister before his university appointment, he was also a preacher of some renown. During university vacations, Martin made himself available for preaching engagements in far-flung districts, including Orkney and Shetland.[7]

---

4 Kenneth Jeffrey S, *When the Lord Walked the Land: The 1858–62 Revival in the North-East of Scotland*, (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2006).

5 *Aberdeen Press & Journal*, 21 Feb 1890.

6 JCM, *Letter to Aunt Jane*, 27 Feb 1857, (C&G1, 264). C&G1 refers to the first edition of: Lewis Campbell & William Garnett, *The Life of James Clerk Maxwell*, (London: Macmillan, 1882).

7 For more on William Martin, his interest in Bishop Butler and the revival, see Alexander Whyte's testimony, in: G.F. Barbour, *The Life of Alexander Whyte*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923), 81f. Whyte was a student under

The year before Maxwell came to Marischal, Martin had published a book on Butler's *Analogy*, commending it to his Sabbath Class at church. Bishop Butler's *Analogy* was written primarily as a rejoinder to the Deists, who acknowledged that God made the universe, but derided the Bible's affirmations that God governs and cares for those whom He created. Butler's approach was to argue that nature confirms, at least by analogy, the teachings of the Bible on eternal life, God's discipline, and so forth. Maxwell's friendship with Martin may explain why Maxwell was reading and admiring Butler's *Analogy* soon after arriving in Aberdeen.[8] In connection with the revival, Martin was key in inviting Reginald Radcliffe to the city in November 1858. Martin also tried to get the use of one of Aberdeen's large parish churches for Radcliffe to speak in. When this was rebuffed, it was Martin who hired the small mission hall in Albion Street for Radcliffe's first meetings.[9]

2. William Pirrie

Another academic who was a keen supporter of revival meetings was Dr. William Pirrie (1807–1882), the Regius Professor of Surgery at Marischal. Pirrie not only attended Reginald Radcliffe's meetings but appeared at services addressed by other key speakers such as Brownlow North, James Smith of Greyfriars, and D.T.K Drummond. Drummond (1805-1877) was an evangelical episcopalian whom Maxwell had first encountered at St. John's Episcopal Church in Edinburgh when he was a schoolboy.[10]

Martin, and later became the renowned preacher of Free St. George's in Edinburgh.

8 JCM, *Letter to Campbell*, 22 Dec 1857, (C&G1, 294).

9 Jeffrey, *When the Lord Walked the Land*, 57. See also: J. Brown, 'A Godly Heritage: Revival in North-East Scotland', Part 1, in *The Believer's Magazine*, April 2016.

10 Cf. *Aberdeen Press & Journal*, 18 Jul 1860: 'Revival of Religion: Open-air meetings at Huntly in the Castle Park, Huntly (kindly granted by Her Grace the Duchess of Gordon), on the 25th and 26th July, to unite in Prayer for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the district and land, and for the Preaching of the Everlasting Gospel. [The following will take part in the services] … William Pirrie M.D, F.R.S.E, Regius Professor of Surgery, Marischal College, Aberdeen; … Reginald Radcliffe, Esq; Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, English Episcopal Church, Edinburgh; … Brownlow North, Esq; Rev. James Smith, Greyfriars' Established Church, Aberdeen … etc.' See also Pirrie's Obituary in the *Dundee Courier*, 22 Nov 1882, which stated that Professor William Pirrie, an elder of the Free West Church, Aberdeen, was a supporter of evangelical and philanthropic movements in the city, frequently making large donations to the Young Men's Christian Institute and the Young Women's Christian

William Pirrie's commitment to the cause of revival is illustrated by an advertisement in the *Aberdeen Press and Journal* for the 18th of July 1860. It announced that there would be open-air meetings at Huntly in the Castle Park, use of which was granted by the Duchess of Gordon. The meetings were prayer meetings, and the focus was to be 'prayer for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the district and land, and for the Preaching of the Everlasting Gospel.' Advertised amongst those who would take part were: William Pirrie M.D, F.R.S.E, Regius Professor of Surgery, Marischal College, Aberdeen; Reginald Radcliffe; Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, English Episcopal Church, Edinburgh; Brownlow North; and the Rev. James Smith, Greyfriars' Established Church, Aberdeen.'

3. James Smith

As already noted, the revival meetings initially took place apart from church premises. But the landscape changed after the Rev. James Smith (1805–1871)—minister of Greyfriars — was moved by the revival, prompting him to open the doors of his church to Radcliffe. Greyfriars Kirk was the collegiate church for Marischal College, and, as one of Marischal's professors, Maxwell worshipped there frequently.

Smith's opening the doors of Greyfriars to revivalist preachers, brought the revival into the heart of college life. Yet not all were happy with what he had done. Smith was censured by his Presbytery and Synod on a technical breach of church law. He was guilty of allowing an unqualified person to preach in Greyfriars. Smith appealed against the censure, taking the matter first to the Synod and then to the General Assembly. When the matter was raised at the 1859 Church of Scotland General Assembly, the Assembly agreed with the lower church courts in terms of church law, though strong speeches supportive of Smith's intentions were made by senior Kirk figures.[11] Despite the Assembly's rebuke, Smith continued to allow Radcliffe to preach in Greyfriars, with William Martin presiding at several meetings and conducting the devotions.[12] A few years later, James Smith moved from Greyfriars Church in Aberdeen to Ellon Parish Church. There he succeeded the late Rev. Donald Dewar (1831-1862), who had been Maxwell's brother-in-law.

Institute. We note that Professor William Pirrie should not be confused with Professor William Robinson Pirie, who was also at Marischal.

11 *Scotsman*, 24 May 1859.

12 The Greyfriars' elders were divided on the issue. See: Greyfriars Kirk Session Minutes: 1851–1868, 4 & 7 Jul 1859, (NRS/CH2/492/2/251–256).

DANIEL DEWAR, PRINCIPAL OF MARISCHAL COLLEGE

The most powerful support for revivalism within Marischal College came from Maxwell's own father-in-law, Principal Daniel Dewar (c.1783-1867). Given the controversy raised in Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly concerning the use of Greyfriars church for revivalist preaching, the fact that Daniel Dewar threw his weight behind the movement so publicly was noteworthy.

In December 1859, a year after Radcliffe arrived in Aberdeen, seven months after James Smith defended his position at the General Assembly, and a month after Charles Finney's meetings in the Music Hall, Daniel Dewar republished one of his monographs, entitled *The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Revival of Religion, and the Duty of Christians in regard to It*. The monograph sold for fourpence (postage free for three copies) and was distributed widely.[13]

Dewar had written the monograph twenty years earlier, following a remarkable communion season in Kilsyth which affected him deeply. That was when Kilsyth experienced revival during the ministry of the Rev. William Burns (1779–1859). There had been a famous revival in Kilsyth a century previous, but it was the one of 1839 which Daniel Dewar experienced. Remembrance of these dramatic days in Kilsyth meant much to Dewar; and in 1859 he was excited at the possibility of them being repeated in Aberdeen. He recalled the huge gatherings of between ten and twelve thousand persons; of twelve hundred taking the sacrament on the communion Sunday; of over eighty new professions of faith on one day alone; and of baptisms in the local mill pond. He recollected William C. Burns (jnr) (1815–1868) from Dundee preaching to thousands by moonlight. And he remembered the ministry of Dr. Cesar Malan (1787–1864) who had come from Geneva, and of himself preaching from a high exterior flight of stairs to thousands who were gathered in the fields before him.[14]

Dewar's openness to what happened at Kilsyth came from a deeply-engrained sympathy with evangelistic campaigns. This was rooted in the formative influence on his own Christian faith from the itinerant preacher John Farquharson (fl. 1800). The Kilsyth revival had also seen various ecstatic phenomena such as swooning and convulsions and shouting — not all of which Daniel Dewar was comfortable with— but, for Dewar, the dominant personal memory of the Kilsyth revival was of a mighty movement of the Spirit of God. And so, in May 1860, Dewar demonstrated that he was committed irrevocably to the revivalist cause. At

[13] *Aberdeen Press & Journal*, 14 Dec 1859.

[14] Cf. *Scotsman*, 2 Oct 1839, and *Fifeshire Journal*, 3 Oct 1839.

the Church of Scotland General Assembly, he moved that the Assembly should give thanks to God for the revivals. Here we recall that, only a year earlier, the Assembly had rebuked James Smith for allowing Greyfriars to be Radcliffe's preaching base. Now Dewar was showing which side of the fence he was on. His carefully worded motion, approved by the Assembly, stated:

> While by no means committing itself to an approval of all that may have accompanied recent religious movements, [this Assembly] agrees to recommend to all ministers and elders of this Church special watchfulness and prayer in regard to the progress of vital religion in their parishes—*watchfulness*, lest that which is holy may be abused, or that which is good discouraged; —and *prayer*, that God may be pleased still farther to revive his own work in the midst of the years, and to grant unto this Church and the world a yet fuller outpouring of his Holy Spirit.[15]

MAXWELL AND THE REVIVAL

That was the milieu surrounding Maxwell in Aberdeen. But what was his personal reaction? Lewis Campbell (1830-1908) was Maxwell's close friend and first biographer. In Campbell's *Life of James Clerk Maxwell*, we have the briefest of references to what was going on spiritually in Aberdeen. Campbell records:

> Amongst the human phenomena surrounding him, one which genuinely interested him was the religious 'revival' which took place about that time in Scotland. His intercourse with evangelical friends in England had prepared him to sympathise with such 'experiences' and his Calvinistic reading had familiarised him with the language used.[16]

There are two things to note. First: though Lewis Campbell was Maxwell's life-long friend from schooldays in Edinburgh, Campbell was not himself of an evangelical persuasion. Campbell was heavily influenced at Oxford by Benjamin Jowett (1817-1893), one of the leading liberal scholars of the Church of England. What we see at various points in Campbell's biography of Maxwell is a downplaying of Maxwell's evangelical piety. Second: despite Campbell's bias, he did acknowledge Maxwell's interest in the revival movement. Here we bemoan the fact that much of Maxwell's personal correspondence was lost in a fire at Glenlair.

---

15 *Aberdeen Press & Journal*, 30 May 1860.

16 C&G1, 260.

What else can we reconstruct of the connection between Maxwell and the revival? [17] After James Clerk Maxwell married Katherine Dewar in 1858, they lived the first few years of their married life in rooms in her parents' house. It is certain that revivalism would be discussed in the Dewar household, which now included James and Katherine. Like his father-in-law, Maxwell welcomed the movement. At the same time, Maxwell was wary of aspects of over-excited religious fervour, with his remarks on some of the features of the 1843 Disruption testifying to his concerns on that front. What were these concerns? And why did they arise?

To understand the caution in Maxwell's interest in the revival, we need to return to the family home at Glenlair in Galloway. When the Clerk Maxwells first went there in the 1830s, the parish kirk for them was at Parton, which lay several miles away, over rough tracks which were almost unusable in the winter. Maxwell's father—John Clerk Maxwell (1790-1856)—was not only a heritor of Parton Kirk, but one of its elders, and when the kirk at Parton was being rebuilt in the 1830s John Clerk Maxwell argued that it should not be rebuilt on the same site, but should be repositioned more centrally in the parish, to make it easier for farming folk to get to it. Parton is on the extreme western edge of its parish, on the banks of Loch Ken. It is geographically remote from much of the parish: farmers, shepherds, agricultural-workers, villagers in the various hamlets found it too great a distance. However, John Clerk Maxwell failed to persuade his other heritors to rebuild at a more central location, and so Parton kirk was rebuilt on its traditional site. Nevertheless, he did not give up. And so, as well as helping to pay for Parton Kirk to be rebuilt, he and his friend and fellow-heritor, Major Charles Fletcher, built another kirk near the village of Corsock. This was completed in 1839 and was officially

[17] Marston, 'Maxwell, Faith and Physics', 267, [In: Flood, McCartney, Whitakers (eds.), *James Clerk Maxwell: Perspectives on his Life and Work*, (Oxford: OUP, 2014)] refers to a series of letters, penned by 'Omicron' in March 1859 to an anonymous recipient, entitled: *Five Letters on the Religious Movement in Aberdeen: with an Appendix on the Nature, Probability and Necessity of a Religious Revival*. Marston suggests the writer may have been Maxwell since the writer: (a) indicates he will meet the recipient at the British Association in Aberdeen in September; (b) has a high regard for Scripture; (c) displays familiarity with the established church, the Church of Scotland; (d) refers to theologians such as Jonathan Edwards (whom Maxwell read); and (e) discusses the Smith and Radcliffe situation. If the author were Maxwell, then the letters shed great light on his faith. However, we are hesitant about the attribution since others could equally fit the bill. The style of writing also feels non-Maxwellian. For over a century, 'Omicron' was a popular nom de plume for writers who wished to remain anonymous.

designated by the Church of Scotland as a mission station of Parton Kirk, with weekly services and other meetings. This new kirk was a huge success. The congregation grew and flourished. They had their own minister, who was under the overall authority of the Parton minister, and folk who in the past struggled to make the journey to Parton now became regular worshippers.

Then came 1843 and the Disruption. Almost overnight, this new congregation at Corsock was split in two. Half stayed. The other half left and formed a group in Kirkpatrick Durham. The split which took place, and the effect on the new young congregation, distressed John Clerk Maxwell deeply. He became suspicious of what he saw as emotional fervour, and this feeling was shared by his son, James Clerk Maxwell. In his biography of Maxwell, Lewis Campbell wrote:

> Something, I forget what, led the conversation to the perilousness of strong religious excitement in early youth, on account of the spiritual exhaustion and permanent religious insensibility that are apt to follow the dying-out of the original fervour, and that derive a plausible justification from the premature and fallacious experience. He spoke with thankfulness of his own escape from a similar danger. 'The ferment,' he said, 'about the Free Church movement had one very bad effect. Quite young people were carried away by it ; and when the natural reaction came, they ceased to think about religious matters at all, and became unable to receive fresh impressions. My father was so much afraid of this, that he placed me where I should be under the influence of Dean Ramsay, knowing him to be a good and sensible man.' [18]

When James Clerk Maxwell experienced the 1859 Revival in Aberdeen, it seems that he was pulled in two directions. On the one hand, along with his father-in-law Daniel Dewar, and along with his academic friends at the University, he welcomed the revival and the spiritual forces which were at work. On the other hand, he was suspicious about over-emotional responses. In 1843 his father had felt that some, who were initially caught up in the excitement and emotion of the event, later fell away totally from where they had been. Maxwell had similar fears. He agreed with the theology of the revival. It appears that he welcomed its impact but was hesitant about the more extreme emotions attached to it.

AN EVANGELICAL HUNGER

By 1860, Maxwell's time in Aberdeen had come to an end. He now became Professor of Natural Philosophy at King's College in London. During

[18] Cf. C&G1, 420.

James and Katherine's years in London, it is clear where their spiritual hearts lay. At several of his posts Maxwell was expected to attend the University chapel connected with the college where he studied or taught, but in London there was no such obligation. It is significant, therefore, that the Maxwells attended—by their free choice—John Offord's Baptist Chapel which was near their home. He loved the ministry of John Offord. Maxwell had an aversion to 'smart-Alec' preachers. He especially disliked University Dons who could take a verse of Scripture and then ingeniously make it mean its opposite! What Maxwell wanted was a preacher who dug into the Word of God. He wanted a preacher to *treat the Word of God*, as a scientist *treated the Works of God*. The preacher should allow scripture to reveal its own truth, just as the scientist should allow nature to make itself known. He found that in Offord.

From time to time, James Clerk Maxwell also went to listen to Baptist Wriothesley Noel. In one of his letters, he told Katherine about Pastor 'Baptist' Noel's church in London, and how had enjoyed the simplicity of the message and the worship.[19] Pastor Noel's seriousness, and his evangelical preaching, appealed to him. He wrote to Katherine:

> I have come from Mr. Baptist Noel. The church was full to standing, and the whole service was as plain as large print. The *exposition* was the Parable of Talents, and the *sermon* was on John 3:16. The sermon was the text writ large, nothing ingenious or amusing, and hardly any attempt at instruction, but plain and very serious exhortation from a man who evidently believes neither more nor less than what he says.

Maxwell's choice of ministry in London reveals his heart. Away from University contexts in which he was obliged to attend worship in the college chapel, he chose preachers such as John Offord and 'Baptist' Noel.

CONCLUSION

Back in Corsock, the wounds and pain of the Disruption took time to heal, but they did. For the closing decade of James Clerk Maxwell's short life, the Church of Scotland minister in Corsock was George Sturrock, and the Free Church minister was Dr. Robert Smith (1816-1894). Together, Sturrock and Smith did much to heal the raw wounds created by past events.

---

[19] The Honourable Wriothesley Noel (1798–1873) came from minor aristocracy and was raised in the Church of England. From 1827 until 1848 he was minister of the evangelically inclined Anglican congregation of St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, London, before becoming a Baptist minister.

Maxwell died on the 5th of November 1879. Two days later, at the Corsock *Mutual Improvement Society*, George Sturrock spoke on the topic of 'Science and Religion'. In the chair for that meeting was Robert Smith of the Free Church. The *Galloway News and Kirkcudbrightshire Advertiser*, in reporting the meeting, noted that Dr. Smith of Corsock Fee Church occupied the chair and introduced his brother of the established Church in 'very graceful terms'. That amity would have gladdened the heart of James Clerk Maxwell. He was a man, a Christian man, of whom it could truly be said that he: '*lived justly, loved kindness, and walked humbly with his God and Saviour.*' (Micah 6:8).

The Relationship between Moltmann's Eschatology, the Theology of Hope, and the Contemporary History of the Korean church

Chorong Shin

INTRODUCTION

Jürgen Moltmann is a twentieth-century reformed theologian who opened a new theological paradigm. He broke away from existentialist and orthodox theology and opened a theology of 'hope.' He identified 'eschatology', overlooked in Christianity, as the most significant aspect of Christianity. His eschatology does not address the end, but rather the future and hope after the end. Moltmann's book, *Theology of Hope*, published in 1964, attracted attention from the global theological community. His theology gave rise to a discussion about what kind of Christian hope can exist in a place where one must confront the difficulties of reality. I would like to look at how Moltmann established the *Theology of Hope* and compare it with other theologians who mentioned 'hope' like him. In addition, I also would like to know how Moltmann has influenced the Korean church from the 1970s to the present, from 'Minjung Theology,' Korea's progressive political theology, to conservative theology and the Pentecostal Church.

MOLTMANN'S THEOLOGY OF HOPE

Moltmann published *Theology of Hope* in Germany in 1964. His book deconstructed the existentialist and secular theologies that became popular after World War II, bringing him fame worldwide. This work sought to bridge the gap between present Old Testament theological studies and New Testament theology. He also attempted to overcome postwar existentialist views. This book contains five chapters, excluding the introduction. Chapter 1 focused on eschatology and revelation. He compared and evaluated Barth and Bultmann's theologies, and showed how salvation-historical and universal-historical eschatology can merge to form an eschatology of revelation. Chapter 2 "Promise and History" discusses the relationship between God's promise and revelation in the Old Testament. Chapter 3 "The Resurrection and the Future of Jesus Christ," argues for the eschatological dimensions of the crucifixion and resurrection in the

New Testament. Chapter 4 discusses 'eschatology and history' and offers an eschatological approach to understanding history. Chapter 5 examines Christianity in modern culture from an eschatological perspective, emphasizing the character and mission of the church as a gateway to the future. *Theology of Hope* has a stunning introduction. Moltmann made it very evident in the introduction why he seeks hope.

He objected to the theological climate in which eschatology was regarded as insignificant for Christian doctrine. This is because eschatology–it seemed at the time– had no logical connection to Christ's cross, resurrection, exaltation, and reign.[1] However, Moltmann redefined the term "eschatology." Eschatology is a teaching that includes both the object of hope and the hope that is fuelled by it. This is also a hope, anticipation, and a forward-looking march. The Christian faith comes from Jesus' resurrection on the cross and leads toward the promise of his universal future. He argued that eschatology is the suffering and passion caused by the Messiah. The God of eschatology is a God of hope known through the Exodus and prophecies in the Old Testament and a God who has the future as an attribute of existence. Because this God meets us in future promises, we can wait with hope for God in our lives. Christian eschatology starts from the historical reality of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus and talks about its future, possibility, and power.

Moltmann explains the relationship between faith and hope as follows: Christian faith can break down the boundaries of life surrounded by pain, sin, and death when they collapse. Faith can be expanded into hope through the resurrection of the Crucified One, even when all human hope has been crushed. This faith links people to Christ. Hope allows this faith to open itself to the great future of Christ. [2] Faith is the foundation upon which hope is built, and hope nourishes and supports faith. In the Christian life, faith comes first, but hope is superior. Without the recognition of Christ through faith, hope becomes a vain utopian hope. However, if there is no hope, faith collapses, becomes smaller, and eventually becomes a dead faith. In this way, faith turns hope into certainty. Hope expands this faith and brings it to life. For those who hope, resurrection is a consolation given to lives that must suffer and die, and God's resistance against the wickedness of suffering and evil. Paul called death 'the last enemy' (1 Corinthians 15:26), but paradoxically, the resurrected Christ and the hope of resurrection became the enemies of death.[3] Hope does not

1 Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology* (London: SCM, 1967), 1.

2 Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 5.

3 Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 7.

allow humans to be satisfied until the day when all of God's promises are fulfilled. It is a restless hope for God.

Moltmann argued that despair, on the other side of hope, is sin. God provides humans with prospects, hope, and promises for the future, but humans get discouraged and frustrated. Not trusting expectations is a sin. The same applies to helplessness and grief. Hope presupposes despair. Despair is defined as a hurried desire for the fulfilment of hope or a refusal to have any hope at all. This is despair in the guise of presumption. This type of presupposition is seen in early nineteenth-century German idealism. This is the sanctification of Prometheus. They also changed the image of Christ into Prometheus. The mid-century existentialist literature focused on Sisyphus. Sisyphus symbolizes frustration. Despite his fight, determination, and endurance, he became the image of a failure. However, the power to transform life lies not in presumption and despair, but in steadfast hope that lasts till the end. Hope does not look to 'no place', but rather to 'no place as yet' that may exist eventually.[4]

He declared that the fiercest objection to a theology of hope comes from religions of humble acquiescence in the present. Christian hope and its consequent objection to the transcendence of consciousness always assert the rights of the present, the interests at hand, and the eternal truth of each moment. This eternal present rejects hope for what does not yet exist. Christian hope seems to cheat people by deceiving them of present happiness. However, Moltmann found the 'God of hope' in the history of the Bible. The God of hope exists by promising the future of God, humanity, and the world, and sending humans into a history that does not yet exist. God makes promises to those who obey God's mission. God promises God's presence and kingdom and offers a vision of the future. Moltmann discovered a God who 'has the future as an attribute of existence' and a God of promise, a God who escapes from the present into the future, and a God who provides the future and newness from God's freedom. Because God's promises open the future, God's truth is also experienced in history. [5] God is present when we live God's promises through hope and transformation. Faith does not exist within each day but rather extends beyond it in expectation of what is to come, as promised by the One who created from nothing and revived the dead. Hope permits us to bear the 'cross of the present', embrace the deceased, and anticipate the unexpected. Hope does not deceive people into seeing present happiness; rather, it creates present happiness. Hope leads to cheerful waiting because it is waiting on God. This pleasant waiting allows you to accept

4 Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 10.

5 Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 15.

all of your gifts. As a result, even during difficult times, humans can feel happy.

Moltmann stated at the end of the introduction that through hope, which is further encouraged by God's promise, all historical concepts would take on an eschatological tendency and become provisional.[6] Christians think that God, who exalted Jesus from the dead, would make everything new. This hope paves the way for a comprehensive future that includes death. Christian hope is a valuable complement to faith. This hope of faith gives the prospect of a fresh start in the promised future, making it the finest option for anything that can be sought on this earth. As a result, these hopes expand reality and make us look forward to the future.

THE HOPE OF BLOCH, BONHOEFFER AND MOLTMANN

How did the concept of 'hope' that goes throughout Moltmann's eschatology arise? His memories of war and prison camps shaped his theological understanding of 'hope'. Bloch's work, *Principle of Hope*, had a profound influence on him. Bloch was a Marxist Jewish philosopher, who wrote the *Principle of Hope* during World War II, creating his worldview despite the godlessness of harsh reality. Unlike Marx, who saw religion as the 'opium of the people,' he highlighted its importance. He saw religion as a reflection of human hopes and utopian desires.[7] He thought apocalyptic hope meant a radical vision for a better future on Earth. However, Bloch removed God from the kingdom of hope he had created. This is because the kingdom of God that he built was a kingdom of freedom without God's intervention. Therefore, for Bloch, the highest good of human beings is the new heaven and the 'freedom' for it. He thought that human freedom could only be guaranteed if God did not exist, and that where there is a great ruler of the world, there is no freedom.

By way of contrast Bonhoeffer developed his religious views while resisting Nazism. Eschatology provided the foundation for his theology's core concept. His eschatology focused on world transformation rather than exchange. His eschatological studies expanded to include the relationship between the 'ultimate' and the 'penultimate', or everything preceding the ultimate.[8] Bonhoeffer, unlike Bloch, does not reject the exist-

6 Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 18.

7 Hyongsang Ko, "Eschatological Hope in the Era of Godlessness and Its Ethical Implications: A Focus on E. Bloch, D. Bonhoeffer, and J. Moltmann," *Korean Journal of Christian Studies* 117 (2020): 127.

8 M. R. Lindsay, "Bonhoeffer's eschatology in a world "come of age"," *Theology Today* 68.3 (2011): 300.

ence of God in his eschatological vision. To him, God is a powerless being who is aware of human misery and pain. He believes that, despite God's powerlessness in the world, God is nevertheless there and helping us. This is because for him Jesus is God and God is the most powerful in powerlessness. He states, "without God before God," which means we must accept responsibility for our life and live "as if God did not exist." This refers to human independence and responsibility without dependence on divine intervention.[9] Jesus Christ was the model that best represented his claims. This is because Jesus participated in God's suffering without God in his secular life. He presented the cross of Jesus as an absolute model for our lives and encouraged us to follow His cross. By following the cross, we can practice responsible love for others.

Moltmann's theology of hope built on these foundations. For him, eschatology is the fulfilment of hope for the future. It does not mean the fulfilment of any specific event, but rather the promise of God that will soon come true. The most important events in his eschatology are the crucifixion and resurrection. The two events are connected. There is no resurrection without crucifixion. Crucifixion is God letting Jesus die, and resurrection is God raising Jesus from death. Moltmann argues that this allows us to see God's future promises. He meditates on God's promise to come to resist the social evils that create violence and injustice in reality.

As for Korean reception, Hyeongsang Ko organized the main differences in the three scholars' thoughts on hope in his article. According to him, their hopes can be summarized with the keywords 'freedom', 'responsibility', and 'promise'.[10] They all present a position of eschatological hope and its ethical implications. I think Moltmann's hope combines Bloch's hope for the future kingdom of God and Bonhoeffer's hope that responsible Christian practice can change the world. It proclaims that God is not a helpless and weak being who suffers along with humans, but is a powerful God of hope who will come as a promise through the historical event of resurrection.

CRITICAL REFLECTION

The more I searched his materials and activities, the more I understood why I was fascinated by Moltmann. First, the reason is the interconnection of his theology and the Minjung Theology. The church I grew up in was founded by a generation influenced by the Minjung Theology. It was natural for us to comment on and criticize social issues and pray for

[9] Ko, "Eschatological Hope," 134.
[10] Ko, "Eschatological Hope," 144.

society. Fundamentalist conservative denominations have attacked my denomination's position for the reason that it secularizes God. However, I do not think that our faith should be directed to the upper reaches of the sky. The world is full of various violence and social issues such as war, poverty, and crime, and that is our life. Our theology cannot be separated from these realities, and we can try to overcome these problems of social evil through theological discussion and reflection. I think this is also connected to Moltmann's political theology. He also took the position that theology should not be divorced from reality but should work together with real problems. Progressive churches in Korea have grown by embracing people who are suffering. However, as society's wealth accumulates, more complex and diverse social problems emerge not just poverty and unreasonable labor contract. Each time Moltmann visited Korea since 1975, he prepared a lecture customized to Korea's changes and diversity. His analytical abilities and understanding have influenced many Korean churches.

The second reason is a link between eschatology and hope. Eschatology is a narrative about the end. (Naturally speaking, nobody knows what happens after death.) Eschatology is inextricably linked to death because death represents the end of humanity. However, Moltmann contends that eschatology announces hope for Christians' futures. Those who believed Jesus was God's Son and the Messiah recalled the terrible disappointment of weakness, rejection, abandonment, and crucifixion.[11] However, by resurrecting from the dead, Jesus proved God's presence once more. This was the fulfilment of God's promise. The resurrection of Jesus from the dead on the cross has given Christians hope for a new world filled with God's promises. According to Moltmann, this hope is not only for eternity but also for our concrete future and immanent transcendence. Messianic hope is a healing energy that counteracts the helpless' indifference and the powerful's cynicism.[12] The word "hope" has positive connotations. Hope is inevitably directed toward the future. As a result, we hold onto the 'hope' of God's promise and live for the world beyond we die. I believe in the power of this 'hope'. No matter how dark the valley we walk through is, the 'hope' that the Lord promised and will come in the end keeps us going. I believe Moltmann was also aware of the good impact his theology of 'hope' had on individuals throughout his horrible experience in World War II. Despite oppression and resistance, he witnessed the

[11] Jürgen Moltmann, "The presence of god's future: The risen Christ," *Anglican Theological Review* 89.4 (2007): 580.

[12] Jürgen Moltmann, "The future of theology," *The Ecumenical Review* 68.1 (2016): 11.

spirit of Christianity prospering through hope in many places, including Korea.

Finally, I am drawn to Moltmann's understanding of reality and the variety of relationships. Rather than treating theology as a sacred subject and studying God and his word, he concentrates on how to apply theology in our actual reality. His theology is quite practical. This is demonstrated even more clearly by the themes he talked about during his visit to Korea. When he first visited Korea in 1975, he delivered a lecture titled "Hope in the People's Struggle." After meeting Pastor Yong-gi Cho at a Pentecostal Church conference, he presented "Theology of the Holy Spirit and Life" in 2000 and "Theology of Hope and Life" in 2004. The presentation was entitled "The Gospel Full of Life." Since then, he has given contemporary analyses of the realities of the Korean church and society in lectures like "The Name is Justice: God's Justice for Victims and Perpetrators of Evil" (2009) and "Love, Justice, and Peace" (2012).[13]

THE INFLUENCE OF MOLTMANN ON KOREAN CHURCH

Four years after Moltmann published *Theology of Hope*, his book was introduced in Korean churches through journals and symposiums starting in 1968. In 1973, *Theology of Hope* was translated into Korean. This led to many discussions about Moltmann's theology within the Korean church.[14] Afterward, many of his books were also translated into Korean. The translation process was very quick and accurate. This is the decisive factor that made Moltmann's theology widely accepted and understood in Korea.[15] Furthermore, some theologians returned to Korea after receiving their doctoral degrees from the University of Tübingen, where Moltmann worked. They contributed greatly to the popularization of Moltmann's theology in Korea. They played a very important role in Korean seminaries and churches.

Moltmann''s first visit to Korea took place in 1975 at Hanshin University, at the invitation of his student, Professor Pong-Nang Park. He met students and theologians who opposed the military government. It was his first contact with Minjung theologians. He recalled how their way of resistance reminded him of Bonhoeffer.[16] Moltmann wrote 'Min-

[13] Ok Su Shin, "A Study of Reception and Understanding of J. Moltmann in Korea," *Korean Journal of Systematic Theology*, no.35 (2013): 195.

[14] Pong-Nang Park, "The Theology of J. Moltmann - The eschatological theology," *Theological Studies*, no.14 (1973): 93.

[15] Ok Su Shin, "A Study of Reception," 191.

[16] Jürgen Moltmann, "The Lord has set my feet in a spacious place." Theological Studies no. 54 (2009): 147.

jung Theology' in German in 1984 and was instrumental in introducing Korean Minjung theology to the global theological community. He noted that Minjung theologian Byeong-mu Ahn focused on the 'people' in the Gospel of Mark and attempted to demonstrate the unique bond between Jesus and the poor. Jesus served as the people's teacher, sibling, and family. Jesus represents the people, and they represent Jesus. In other words, Jesus died for the people, while the people died for him. This Christology was recognized as a Christology of Solidarity, in which Jesus bears and shares our suffering. This is similar to the suffering God in *Crucified God* published by Moltmann in 1972. His theology of hope and political theology had a great influence on Minjung theology and activists of the Korean democratization movement. However, Moltmann also pointed out the limit of Minjung theology. Minjung theologians said that Minjung bears the sins of this world and saves this world through his suffering. Moltmann said, "If the people save this world, who will save the people?" raised the question. This is because people try to overcome their hardships rather than trying to suffer them.[17]

Invited to an event commemorating the 100th anniversary of the introduction of Protestantism to Korea in 1984, Moltmann witnessed the conflict between progressive minjung theologians and conservative fundamentalists. He looked at the Korean Protestant Church growing at an incredible rate and the reality of a church that was divided and unable to unite.[18] Until this time, Moltmann had been evaluated in Korea only as a progressive theologian connected to Minjung theology. However, when Moltmann visited Korea in 1995, Pastor Jong-hwa Park, then general clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the Republic of Korea, took Moltmann to a morning meeting with Pastor Yong-gi Cho of Yoido Full Gospel Church. From this period, his relationship with Korea's largest Pentecostal church began. In 2000 and 2004, Moltmann was invited to international symposia held by this church. The meeting between an ecumenical theologian and a pastor of a megachurch representing Korea's conservative camp was very unusual. His actions caused a stir in the Korean theological community, and progressive theologians who were critical of the Pentecostal movement even felt betrayed by him.[19] Pastor Yong-gi Cho announced in 2005, following his conversation with Moltmann, that he would abandon the ministry of individual soul salvation in favour of salvation that covers everything. Pastor Yong-gi Cho admitted that he neglected soci-

17 Moltmann, "The Lord," 148-149.

18 Moltmann, "The Lord," 150.

19 Jürgen Moltmann, and David Suh, "Christ is the foundation of my theological thought." *Theology and Church* 1 (2014): 270.

etal injustice and was unconcerned about natural disasters and that he regretted his previous concentration solely on humanity. He proclaimed his desire to establish a Pentecostal church that embraces the world with Jesus Christ. Yoido Full Gospel Church experienced a fresh turning point thanks to its association with Moltmann.

His ecumenical stance originates from his desire to inspire all Korean theological lines and Christians with hope for the return of Christ and the establishment of a kingdom of justice and peace. His relations with the Korean church were both friendly and productive. He witnessed Korea's political difficulties and the resurgence and development of the Korean church. He served as a facilitator in the formation of Korean theology, as well as a friend who cared about the lives of Korean Christians. Moltmann and Korean theology maintain friendship through dialogue and cooperation.

CONCLUSION

Moltmann's theology of hope revolutionized global Christianity. He shifted the theological community's emphasis, which had previously been on humans rather than God and death rather than life, to the powerful force of hope. He is still alive and continues to publish books and give seminars. He expresses hope in God's promise to come to Christians following the dramatic historical event of the Cross and Resurrection. His compelling message of hope became the light of a people under oppression, as well as the solace of those shivering in prison. It provided an opportunity for the church, which had previously solely looked for individual redemption, to shift its focus to social salvation. I believe Moltmann's broad fellowship and harmonious attitude teach a lesson to the Korean Christian community, which is divided and conflicted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kim, Jin. "Ernst Bloch and Jürgen Moltmann: The Hope for What." *Journal of Korean Philosophical Society* (2018): 217-244.

Ko, Hyongsang. "Eschatological Hope in the Era of Godlessness and Its Ethical Implications: A Focus on E. Bloch, D. Bonhoeffer, and J. Moltmann." *Korean Journal of Christian Studies* 117 (2020): 125-149.

Lindsay, M. R.. "Bonhoeffer's eschatology in a world "come of age"." *Theology Today* 68.3 (2011): 290-302. https://doi.org/10.1177/0040573611416699

Moltmann, Jürgen and Suh, David. "Christ is the foundation of my theological thought." *Theology and Church* 1 (2014): 254-279.

Moltmann, Jürgen. "Hope And Confidence: A Conversation with Ernst Bloch 1." *Dialog* 7.4 (1968): 42-55.

Moltmann, Jürgen. "The crucified god." *Theology Today* 31.1 (1974): 6-18.

Moltmann, Jürgen. "The future of theology." *The Ecumenical Review* 68.1 (2016): 3-14.

Moltmann, Jürgen. "The presence of god's future: The risen Christ." *Anglican Theological Review* 89.4 (2007): 577-588.

Moltmann, Jürgen. "The Lord has set my feet in a spacious place." *Theological Studies* no. 54 (2009): 133-155.

Moltmann, Jürgen. *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*. London: SCM, 1967.

Park, Pong-Nang. "The Theology of J. Moltmann - The eschatological theology." *Theological Studies*, no.14 (1973): 91-188.

Shin, Ok Su. "A Study of Reception and Understanding of J. Moltmann in Korea." *Korean Journal of Systematic Theology*, no.35 (2013): 189-222.

Divine Generosity: The Scope of Salvation in Reformed Theology. By Richard J. Mouw. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2024. ISBN 978-0-8028-8390-2, ix + 133 pp. £14.99

I have long admired Richard Mouw's irenic spirit and concern for contemporary issues, coupled with a respect for the Reformed tradition and a desire to remain biblically faithful. These qualities are evident in his latest book, *Divine Generosity*. However, this reviewer at least wonders if on this occasion he has not pushed the limits of orthodoxy a little far.

Mouw begins by asserting that not only is he not a universalist, but he has no desire to be one. He believes that 'the idea of universal salvation fails to capture some important elements in the Bible's teaching on the importance of divine justice' (p. 1). But, writing as a neo-Calvinist, influenced by the writings of Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck, Mouw develops the concept of common grace which teaches 'that there are manifestations of a positive, but nonsaving, attitude of God to the nonelect' that 'takes seriously working for the well-being of the larger human condition' (p. 13). Although this perspective has not gone unchallenged in the Reformed community – Mouw mentions Cornelius Van Til in passing and Herman Hoeksema in more detail – this is largely an inhouse debate. Common grace is not a particularly controversial concept in Reformed theology generally and can be traced back at least to John Calvin (p. 15).[1]

Mouw moves from here to a slightly more controversial position, for which he is able to cite the impeccably Reformed 'Old Princeton' theologians, particularly Charles Hodge, A.A. Hodge, Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, and Geerhardus Vos, as well as their Union Theological Seminary (New York) contemporary, W. G. T. Shedd. These theologians were involved in a debate that took place among Presbyterians in the United States about the perceived need for revisions to the Westminster Confession of Faith, particularly on the salvific status of children who die in infancy. The third section of the Confession's tenth chapter, 'Of Effectual Calling', states that 'Elect infants dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word.' Some took this to mean that elect infants are to be distinguished from non-elect infants;

[1] Mouw references John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans Ford Lewis Battles, Library of Christian Classics, vols. 20 and 21 (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1960), 2/3.3, p. 293.

others that elect infants dying in infancy are to be distinguished from those who survive to adulthood and are saved by the Word and Spirit. The Princeton theologians, although they disagreed with other proposed revisions, did agree 'with those pushing for a confessional revision that makes it clear that God saves *all* children who die before they are capable of understanding the claims of the gospel' (p. 35). Shedd also agreed. Again, this was and is more or less an in-house debate.

Where Mouw takes the argument further is in his interpretation of 'all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word.' This surely includes those who are mentally incapable of understanding gospel preaching, but Mouw speculates that it may also include those who have never heard the gospel at all. Here, he develops an argument he first heard from his predecessor as president of Fuller Theological Seminary, David Hubbard.

In speaking of the paralytic whose friends lowered him on a mat through the roof of the building where Jesus was, Hubbard noted that it was when Jesus saw 'their faith' that he said to the man, 'Friend, your sins are forgiven you' (Luke 5:20 NRSV). From this, Mouw develops the idea that 'God honors our efforts to have faith *on behalf of others*' (emphasis Mouw's). This is then applied to various circumstances: a grieving mother's prayers for her deceased son who had been killed in the act of committing a robbery, but who had previously expressed a desire to change his ways; a young alcoholic woman who had been abused by her father, regarded as a saint in the Christian community. She consequently found it impossible to pray to God as 'Father', but understood her need to reach out to a 'Higher Power' and had made resultant changes in her life; praying for deceased Buddhist ancestors in an Asian context where respect for ancestors is paramount; 'Christian rituals of ancestral veneration', where the focus is on 'evangelizing of and communion with the dead' in a manner that involves 'an important representational task' (which sounds suspiciously like Mormon baptism for the dead). Then there are numerous examples of those whose actual faith is better than their theology, such as certain liberal theologians (e.g. Schleiermacher whom Charles Hodge regarded as a devout worshipper of Christ); some 19th century Unitarians who gave evidence of a vital faith in Christ, something Shedd apparently recognized; Mormons with whom Mouw has had extensive conversations over a period of years, and even Muslims who love Jesus.

Mouw takes the idea of representation from Suzanne McDonald's *Re-imagining Election: Divine Election as Representing God to Others and Others to God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), which rather curiously is based on the teachings of both the Puritan John Owen and the neo-orthodox Karl Barth. He appears to be on surer ground when he

returns to Warfield and Shedd. Warfield's essay 'Are There Few That be Saved?' argued that 'the salvation of a vast number of human beings is not unthinkable from a Calvinist perspective' (p. 104).[2] Shedd went further, as paraphrased by Mouw: 'A person in an unevangelized region experiences a deep sorrow for his corrupt deeds and thoughts and senses the need to rely for forgiveness and correction on something beyond himself. He pleads for mercy in his heart and begins to lead a life marked by gratitude for the spiritual resources that have entered his life.' Mouw opines that '[o]n Shedd's characterization of this case, the man is showing the fruits of election, which means the Spirit has planted the seed of redemption in his soul. The man does not know who his Savior is, but, says Shedd, the man would acknowledge Jesus as the guarantor of his salvation if he were to hear the gospel message. Nor does Shedd seem to think this kind of case is extremely rare' (p. 104).[3]

Warfield and his Princeton colleagues did not go as far as Shedd, but Warfield pointed out that his own view that the saving work of Christ 'shall embrace the immensely greater part of the human race' was shared by Charles Hodge and influential Southern Presbyterian pastor and theologian, latterly of Virginia's Union Theological Seminary (now Union Presbyterian Seminary), Robert L. Dabney. In Dabney's case, 'for instance', Mouw notes that he 'tossed in a postmillennial projection about a mass conversion in a time that is yet to come in human history'. Mouw considers this to be a 'questionable prediction' but believes that Dabney 'more than compensates for that…with his declaration that the number of the elect will be comprised of 'the vast majority of the whole mass of humanity, *including all generations*' (emphasis Mouw's). Despite the 'for instance' qualifier, it seems to me that Mouw does not take adequate account of the fact that Shedd and his Princeton heroes, except for Vos, were also postmillennialists and that this figured prominently in their thinking. Besides, their concern for the salvation of all children dying in infancy involved the fact that this was a frequent occurrence in human history up to their time. Mouw recognises this as a factor in the large number of the elect, but thinks it falls short of 'the vast majority of the whole mass of humanity,' without including 'huge numbers of adult human beings who have died without ever hearing the gospel proclaimed' (p. 123).

Returning to his own Dutch Reformed roots, Mouw notes that while Kuyper was 'convinced of the small number view' (a point Warfield dem-

---

2 Mouw references Benjamin Warfield, *Are There Few That Be Saved?* (New York: Our Hope Publications, 1918).

3 See W. G. T. Shedd, *Calvinism Pure and Mixed: A Defense of the Westminster Standards* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1986), pp.10-11.

onstrates in his essay), his close colleague Bavinck was certainly given to an expansive understanding of the end time (p.123), and one would also have expected this of Kuyper. However, true as this may be, the exact quote Mouw provides from Bavinck says nothing about the salvation of those who have never heard the gospel and Bavinck is quoted earlier as saying, 'In light of Scripture, both with regard to the salvation of pagans and that of children who die in infancy, we cannot get beyond abstaining from a firm judgment, in either a positive or negative sense' (p. 76).[4]

As Bavinck indicates, what ultimately matters is not what any of these men might think, but what Scripture teaches. Of this, Spurgeon (quoted by Mouw on page 8) notes that while 'there is to be a multitude that no man can number in heaven,' he had not found anything in the Bible that says 'there is to be a multitude that no man can number in hell.'[5] Beyond this argument from silence, coupled with the clear teaching on Christ as the only way to the Father (John 14:6) and the consequent obligation to carry the gospel to all nations (Matt 28: 18-20), we are left with the assurance that the Judge of all the earth will do right (Gen 18:25) in the Day of Judgment, just as he did in the destruction of Sodom. However much we might hope that Mouw is right, we must accept (as he does at times) that much of what he develops based on some noted Reformed theologians is speculative, and it is questionable that all (or any) of them would have gone as far as he does.

J. Cameron Fraser, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada

Biblical Critical Theory. How the Bible's Unfolding Story Makes Sense of Modern Life and Culture. By Christopher Watkin. Zondervan 2022.

The late Tim Keller's Introduction offers encouragement: 'But the Bible has its own narratives, images, and patterns that enable us to analyze any culture at the deepest level and to both critique and appreciate it.' So the book has international support. It also plays tribute to a formative time in Cambridge in the late 1990s but also has an Australian flavour as in his referencing of John Dickson, *Bullies and Saints* (Zondervan 2021). The Zondervan brand perhaps puts one on notice that here is a book intended for a wide Christian readership. It will be academic but not resolutely so.

As early as his own preface (xix) the author declares that Augustine's *City of God* was his inspiration. Further, he insists that learning to ask the

[4] Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004) 726.

[5] Charles Spurgeon, Heavenly Worship, the Spurgeon Center, sermon on Rev. 14: 1-3, preached on December 28, 1856, https://www.spurgeon.org/resource-library/sermons/heavenly-worship/#flipbook/.

'so what?' question is crucial, not to forget to mention the consequences for life after the apologetics and doctrine. One might usually call this 'ethics' or moral theology, but that category is avoided, even though there is a good bit of use of Oliver O'Donovan's trilogy (*Self, World and Time*: Eerdmans, 2013-17). When it comes to reading the bible, Watkin is keen to emphasise that what needs to be found are 'figures' or patterns and rhythms from which one can better view the 'ground' around us in our culture, the better to see it as it is. He regularly namechecks Foucault (cf. his own *Michel Foucault,* P&R 2018 but also his *French Philosophy Today: New Figures of the Human in Badiou, Meillassoux, Malabou, Serres and Latour,* EUP, 2018). Every Foucauldian 'episteme' has characteristic patterns and rhythms that determine discourse for it to have meaning. So we need to listen to the language(s), ideas, and stories of the bible, e.g. 'covenant', or Jesus' 'first shall be last' meme.

In terms of real time and space the Bible affirms a scheme of promise and fulfilment, of God the Lord of the Universe, yet with the kingdom of God opposed to that of the world. Christianity was to begin with about a behaviour of meeting on Sundays to worship, and putting relationships to rights, and forming a unity under God's law, with due regard for what is tangible, whether objects like temple or routes that Paul took.

Watkin adds that he appreciates Charles Taylor's alternative term to 'worldview', viz. that of 'social imaginary', which can be defined as 'an implicit grasp of reality', but he settles for 'world' as his preferred term, as something more to do with life and not just ideas. This is the world as it is to 'me'; and yet it is not *Lebenswelt* in a subjective sense, not least since non-human ecosystems are included. The biblical text proposes an imaginary world for us to inhabit, but new situations also can configure our world, and these epistemes can function like texts themselves.

Before one get too carried away with all things postmodern, he calls us to replicate Augustine's subversive mimesis, whereby one takes a pagan 'figure' like spectacle (the circus or arena) so that liturgy becomes counter-/anti-spectacle. This is one rare place where Augustine's *City of God* is heard and used, as opposed to merely cited. He introduces, and will press throughout the idea of 'diagonalization', which means questioning our assumptions leading to a positive and valuable third way not a compromise, avoiding the opposite extremes. However, later he will say (with Spurgeon) that the truth is not to be located in the middle but in the extremes, which appears to contradict what he has just said about the third way. Perhaps the idea is the work of avoiding the absolutizing of the temporal, like a skier winding their way through a slalom course. So perhaps he means something dialectical: embracing extremes on either side. To be sure, he insists we should assume until proven otherwise that inter-

locutors are seeking the good as they understand it'. This sounds none too Augustinian, but perhaps it is the better for that. Later he describes what he calls 'umbilical thinking', whereby one aspect of reality has primacy over all others: this is to be avoided.

One author who gets mentioned but perhaps whose project is not quite given the attention it deserves is John Millbank, with his idea of 'Out-Narrating'. However Milbank has never been obviously 'biblical' as a thinker, and Watkin needs to insist that one large problem is that in the Enlightenment the bible got eclipsed from being the story that made sense of our other stories. The Christian story provided and he believes still (this side of he Enlightenment) provides a 'set of lenses' gathered from the whole storyline, serving not just to help analyse situations and discern between viewpoints, but also to provide a vision. Just as Augustine in the *City of God* 'explains Roman culture within the framework of the biblical story', Watkin's aim is not to explain the bible to our culture but explain our culture through the bible', and hence to arrive at Christian social theory.

So much for the introductory material. Yet before we launch into rehearing the biblical story as promised, we pause in Chapter 1 with the topic of *Trinity and Truth*: there is an eponymous book (I assume the one by Bruce Marshall), he admits he never read, as he recounts in a chatty, anecdotal chapter opening which is typical of the pattern of his chapters. 'The Trinity' is foundationally important because, first, the Absolute is also Personal and ultimate, and reality is personal and dynamic. The Trinity 'provides the blueprint and the mandate for the mediation between the one and the many' and the substratum for the ethics of sameness and alterity –or, one might call it 'love'. It is not that 'Love is God' (D. Bonhoeffer) for there is a need for faith and hope too, as O'Donovan reminds us. Too much fetishizing of 'the Other' in order to avoid totalising/classifying can unfortunately lead to a loss of relating (cf. D.B. Hart). He asserts (relying on Milbank) an ontology of peace (against Hobbes) and speaks of the right use of power as God does, to overpower powers and authorities, by which 'everything impersonal [can get] caught up in the personal'.

So much for a metaphysical prolegomena. Perhaps the bible can start being referenced when the next chapter takes up the topic of Creation? Well in fact the themes are immediately those of gratuitous universe, of transcendence & immanence: but if there is a biblical story to be harnessed this has not quite got going yet. The bible's picture of life as free gift, not the product of a market economy, and therefore the primacy of 'gift' might have been better informed by Milbank's discussion of 'can a gift be given?' (and indeed his scepticism about 'pure gift'), which is ignored here. Watkin asserts the need for form against chaos on our world, some

lines to be etched over against the 'grey' of Samuel Beckett's *Endgame*. He thinks we want to avoid the Lacanian idea that language imposes itself on reality, but also the other extreme that language can parcel up reality. We should speak of enchanted materiality and embodied spirituality. Now, creativity without order is discriminatory and destructive, so there should be a balance of mimesis and poesis. Genesis 1 exposes the objectivist (cf. Liberalism) and the subjectivist (cf. Communitarianism) accounts of reality as being both reductionist, since it is God's interpretation that tells us that what is out there 'was very good.' In tandem with this, there is no absolute fact/value division, although the treatment of this is a bit too brief to convince.

These early chapters rather set the tone, in presenting broad themes, but wherein there is much skipping of the detail of the bible's witness (e.g. no John's gospel on the Trinity), a bit like a PhD student who likes a topic but not what the detail of data says about the topic. That is, he selects some ideas associated with the bible, which are then quickly brought into conversation with present-day thinking, Hence on Sabbath in Genesis, Walter Brueggemann is heard, that Sabbath means resistance: much more could be said about sabbath, but there is a tendency to take one aspect from a biblical theme and run with it. The topics are in the bible but just what the bible has to say about these is a bit in short supply not least because the story approach means that 'if it's Genesis 1, it's creation', rather than attend to *what is said about* creation *across the canon*.

The treatment of the 'Image of God' theme is hugely indebted to Jean-Luc Marion, and is handled with a pleasing amount of erudition. The idea of the 'fall of humanity' as a great leveller is explored with help from Rosenstoeck-Hussey and Alan Jacobs, yet there is very little on sin, and what it might mean for the biblical remedy for sin to be sacrifice. This seems rather a blind spot, as we shall see when we arrive at the chapters on the New Testament.

Exodus gets related to the question of justice, that is, a justice tempered in forgiveness. There was a choice for Israel between slavery (Egypt) and death in the desert, but what they were offered was the liberating experience of Slavery to God. In a section called 'Exodus and modern politics' the Exodus narrative is described as that of a 'history from below'. Much of our politics today is 'Exodus-shaped' and so the reader is encouraged to 'inhabit' Exodus. Divine Law was a gift to prevent vendetta. 'Crucially, the divine origin of the law also grounds the idea that the human being has rights not granted by the state and that can be appealed to against the state. The fact that the law comes from God relativises every human claim to absolute authority.' (277) Interesting but what might this mean in practice? How is that to be parsed? Also, he thinks that it helps to have

a law that is of otherworldly origin in order to balance community and individual rights. This last point seems like a *non sequitur*. Keller, Tom Holland (*Dominion*) and Bavinck are his referees at this point. Given the wealth of scholarship and thinking on natural law and natural rights, one feels he could do better. This is part of the problem with the approach of very short accounts of important topics, giving an impression, sometimes useful but rarely very grounded, then quickly moving on. The 'excuse' might be that this is a book written for non-specialists, yet in other places he is very much ready to show his working in the fields of theory and academic debate, so why not here?

As for Leviticus, well, Leviticus 25 is interpreted as the reordering/resetting of time, and there is a need to gather and re-order it today. At this point there is a bit of Charles Taylor (*A Secular Age*, p. 75) but in terms of OT scholarship, only Christopher Wright is mentioned. Chapter 13 introduces prophecy and cultural critique but seems impatient to get to answer the question: what forms does idolatry take now? For Watkin, too much ideology can result in idolatry, since everyone else is wrong, and this attitude leads to the slavery of disenchantment.

Moving forward to the Wisdom books,' Ecclesiastes is what Walter Brueggemann calls the Bible's counter-testimony critiquing the "core testimony" of Israel's central narrative of God's redemption and providence…' (321, referencing his *Theology of OT* (1997), 360-2. Ecclesiastes is to Proverbs like Kierkegaard or Shestov are to Hegel. What matters is that we don't make the bible in our own image (322). Job strikes the notes of both Proverbs and Ecclesiastes (Hegel and Kierkegaard, again) and maintains within that one book the perspectival diversity that one finds in many parts of the bible. Wisdom is about holding the multiplicity of perspectives together, which he names 'transperspectival' (335, drawing attention to Dooyewaard's *A new Critique of Theoretical Thought* and his term 'perspectual'.)

Watkin takes the opportunity to alert us to the fact that up to a third of the bible is poetry and one must pay attention to its allusive and engaging style. Quite how this fits with reading the bible consecutively as a story is not mentioned. And as for the story, there are only a couple of pages on the exile and Israel (or Judah)'s? hope for the future (339-40).

In Chapter 18 he employs a geographical or topographical metaphor: 'Christ is the heart of the Bible, Paris, to which all biblical narratives lead, and the cross is the Châtelet at the heart of this heart.' The subversive cross (where weakness is not failure, *pace* Nietzsche) breaks open the whole transactional sacrificial arrangement. 'But in God's economy the cross is a delimiting sacrifice, an infinite offering that burst open every marker paradigm of n-shaped tit-for-tat relationships with the divine'.

(401) Following D.B. Hart he calls for a different order of sacrifice from that of the world of the market, of limits and finitude. (407) Grace breaks decisively with the whole performance narrative; grace puts the lines of performance 'under erasure'. For it is mercy, not performance that is required. Love is neither abstract nor loving because of qualities in the thing or person loved. We love the concrete neighbour because he is there, not for what he is.

Chapter 19 deals with the theme of the superabundance of love on the cross and with the asymmetry of divine love and human response. The cross today often gets rejected as the antithesis of human desire. Then, at Chapter 20:

> 'But to say that Jesus rose is to have said far too little. To appreciate the uniqueness and importance of the resurrection for the "so what?" question of Christianity, we need to understand the meaning given to this event in the Scriptures...The resurrection is not merely a historical event…the resurrection being a figure that rhythms and patterns the life and reality of Christians.' (435-6)

Chapter 20 is about the resurrection of Jesus interpreted through Phil 2:5-11, in conversation with O'Donovan , so as to highlight the meaningful life of obedient service as subverting the status quo of 'totality' (with D.B. Hart). One might just note a reservation about the idea which seems patent here, that the Cross was and is about God doing new things in order to transcend the old things which had become useless. Any idea of how Christ might be the end of the law' or what sacrifice might achieve, or how Christ undoes the knots of sin and how sanctification might be a possibility in the church -all this seems absent, which is unexpected in an evangelical and theologically 'orthodox' author.

Chapter 21 concerns the 'counter-story' for us now, and indeed Chapters 21-28 (cf. the chapter titles: 'the last days and…' ; 'Eschatology and… ' are all 'post-NT', as though the bible is behind us and we are in the realm of the present in the light of God's future. Perhaps this is a welcome imbalance in an account of 'the biblical' but imbalance it is.

To end this survey with his own conclusion. This asserts doxology as a way of inhabiting the world, a way of passionate praise, where de-centring and opening of the self is all important. Again D.B. Hart gets quoted before he sums up:

> I hope to have gathered together a collection of insights from the pages of Scripture and from two thousand years of Christian reflection in a somewhat fresh way, mapping them onto the Bible's storyline from Genesis to Revelation and thereby lending them a fresh sense if overall coherence and relation-

> ship to each other. Perhaps one welcome side effect of this task will be to make strange some Christian ideas with which our familiarity has bred contempt: a little exercise in theological *Verfremdung*.' (603)

Well perhaps. That might indeed be the strength of the book.

He admits there are things missing: there could be a lot more on the sacrificial system or the Holy Spirit he concedes. He invites email, but first (like a utilities company might put it: check his website: *thinkingthroughthebible.com*, where the strapline says: '*The Thinking Through the Bible series explores the repeated patterns of the Bible along with its overall narrative shape to generate a series of tools for cultural critique*.') Repeated patterns suggest typology or 'figural reading' and in the first chapter this seemed promising but in the substantive chapters it seemed missing in action. The same might be said for 'the bible's overall narrative shape'. In fact the bible as presented in these chapters seems a very baggy and lopsided one.

Of course this book does not claim to be a biblical theology, but more an exercise in reading the world through the bible. Well, has he managed to explain the culture through the Bible? Not really. He has illuminated the issues in contemporary culture with aplomb, and perhaps even explained them, but the bible feels like background rather than foreground. It is a useful and insightful work of Christian apologetics in the best sense of that term. In comparison with his erudition in the field of French secular thought, there is an ignorance of the theological tradition (the French included) and of biblical exegesis and theology.

Mark W. Elliott, Highland Theological College

The Conflict Between Faith and Experience and the Shape of Psalms 73–83. By Stephen J. Smith. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2024. Pp. 224. £28.99, paperback.

In 2007, Joel S. Burnett wrote that "Arguably the most significant development in Psalms scholarship in recent decades has been attention to the shape and shaping of the Psalter. Nevertheless, one feature of this biblical book's larger structure and meaning that continues to baffle is what scholars call the Elohistic Psalter," referring to Pss 42–83 (Joel S. Burnett, "A Plea for David and Zion: The Elohistic Psalter as Psalm Collection for the Temple's Restoration" in *Diachronic and Synchronic: Reading the Psalms in Real Time: Proceedings of the Baylor Symposium on the Book of Psalms* ed., Joel S. Burnett, W.H. Bellinger Jr, W. Dennis Tucker Jr., New York: T&T Clark, 2007, 95). Stephen J. Smith's new work, *The Conflict Between Faith and Experience and the Shape of Psalms 73–83*, the pub-

lished version of his doctoral dissertation under Duane A. Garrett, offers some clarity on the so-called Elohistic Psalter that straddles books 2 and 3 of the Psalter.

Inspired by Craig C. Broyles, *The Conflict of Faith and Experience in the Psalms: A Form-Critical and Theological Study*, JSOTSup 52 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), Smith, Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies and Christian Ministries at Belhaven University, sees Psalms 73–83 as a collection that answers "a multidimensional collision between 'faith' (i.e., various core Israelite beliefs about God) and 'experience' (the individual/community's current experience of God" (2). Smith's thesis is that Psalms 73–83 are a distinct unit with a "singular theological message: God is *still* good to Israel—despite the conflicting evidence," that is, the Temple's destruction around 586 BCE (2, italics original).

Smith's work impresses in its rigor; from the start Smith reminds us that method determines results, and so lays out the particular way his study discerns editorial critical insights (2–3). For example, he notes that the shared "*Asaph*" superscriptions in both Codex Leningradensis (MS B19A) and the LXX bring Psalms 73–83 together "on a purely formal level," which provides a basis for looking for further literary unity (3). Anyone interested in venturing into editorial criticism of the Psalter should note Smith's methods, as he interacts with sceptics of editorial criticism, such as David Willgren, Eva Mroczek, and Alma Brodersen (4–8). Smith argues that his research satisfies their objections to editorial criticism, writing of the manuscript data on these psalms, "To borrow Willgren's terminology, we see both textual stability *and* paratextual stability" (12, italics original). Likewise, Smith's approach to editorial criticism, also called *Psalterexegese*, is synchronic; he views the collection as resulting "from a single creative act (not a diachronic process) in the wake of the Temple's destruction in 586/587 BCE" (13). Thus, at least one person was behind the "deliberate literary correspondence that exists" in Psalms 73–83 (16).

How does an editorial critic discern unity among psalms? Smith asserts that "'Psalms exegesis' is prior to, and an essential precondition for, *Psalterexegese*" (18). In other words, the individual parts that make up a psalm must be examined before asking questions about how each psalm relates to each other in the larger whole. This must be the case given that the Psalter is a collection of smaller units. The parts and the whole must be taken into account: "At least in principle, *Psalterexegese* and 'psalms exegesis' are not in competition; they are compatible" (18). The overall meaning of a psalms collection cannot "contradict or otherwise do 'violence' to the meaning of any one psalm in the sequence" (19). Here Smith's

careful attention to method disarms those who might dismiss his project simply because of other, less careful editorial critical studies (e.g., see 67).

Smith's introduction lays out more details of his method, such as an emphasis on parallelism (21–25). He builds on Michael Snearly's observation that parallelism can be observed not only on the level of a "line" but between psalms (22–23). Applied to his project, Smith notes echoes of Psalm 73 in the psalms that follow, an observation that others have made but not fully analysed (35). This leads to an "in stereo" effect, with Psalm 73 presenting the heading of the conflict of faith and experience, with the following psalms in the grouping taking up elements of Psalm 73 and discussing them from other angles (36).

Smith's next chapter outlines and interacts with the various views that editorial critics have taken regarding the psalms in question. Worth noting is the "tendency…to essentially collapse 'psalms exegesis' into *Psalterexegese*," which includes reading two discrete texts "as if they are virtually a single continuous psalm (69). Smith is wisely cautious of approaches that take one psalm's placement next to another as permission to overrule the content of that psalm (70).

Chapters 3-8 present Smith's argumentation related to Psalms 73–83. First, Smith discusses the conflict between faith and experience in Psalm 73, noting that "Whatever the catalyst at the temple," by the end, "the psalmist's confidence in God's goodness had been restored" (76). His findings agree that faith clings to God's self-revelation despite experiences that might suggest otherwise, per Ingvar Fløysvik, *When God Becomes My Enemy: The Theology of the Complaint Psalms* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1997), 176 (80). Second, chapter 4 suggests that "Psalms 74–76 is the first of four psalm sequences/pairings that stand in a deliberate parallel relationship with" Ps. 73. In Smith's opinion, Ps. 74 wrestles with the seeming inaction of God (e.g., 74:10–11) related to enemies (83). Ps. 75, likewise, wrestles with the same question but maintains that God will intervene eventually (87). Smith has less to say about Ps. 76, but asserts "significant thematic correspondence" between these three, Pss. 74-76, and Psalm 73 (88–97). This means that Pss 74–76 are a distinct literary unit, and Psalm 73 "is thus something of a hermeneutical key that unlocks the interpretive significance" of their repetitions" (98–99). These psalms reinforce that despite conflicting evidence, God is not defeated or indifferent to his people (100).

Smith's fifth chapter examines Psalms 77–78, which he takes as a second unit in the collection. Despite these having different genres, lament and history, both allude to Ex. 34:6–7 and share an "analogous network of parallels" (109, 112). Ps. 77 mirrors Pss. 73 and 74, Smith argues, with a conflict between faith and experience (111). Likewise, "The transition

to Psalm 78 marks a radical shift in perspective that mirrors the inner-psalm progression to verses 18-28 in Psalm 73" (111). While some of the links Smith perceives between Pss. 73 and 77–78 seem subjective (e.g., "a reflective tone," 118), his evidence is substantial. These parallels are analysed in chapter six, where Smith challenges major scholars' viewpoints, such as both McCann's argument that "the sequence's arrangement points singers/readers *away* from Zion theology as a basis for hope," and Hossfeld and Zenger's emphasis on Ps. 78 as having a "central theological and/or literary position" (133–134, italics original).

"The final two chapters," Smith explains, "are a combined argument for the literary unity of Psalms 79–82" (143). Following the pattern of previous chapters, Smith suggests literary correspondence between Ps. 73 and Pss. 80–81; "Like the first two psalm groupings…this psalm sequence also mirrors the major literary progression of Psalm 73's two halves" (150). After presenting argumentation, Smith concludes chapter 7 by stating that the theological message of these two psalms, with Ps. 73 in view, is that "Faith clings to God's self-revelation amid conflicting evidence" (157). Lest we forget Ps. 79, Smith returns to it in chapter nine, wherein he agrees with Hossfeld and Zenger that "Psalm 79 engages with the destruction of the Temple and the fundamental crisis brought on in and by that event" (160). Ps. 79 is paired with Ps. 82 "though separated by two intervening psalms" (166). Smith views the intervening psalms 80–81 as the centre of an "editorial chiasmus" (171). The significance of this being that "the entire sequence of Psalms 74–82…is organized to engage and resolve a singular crisis," that is, God's perceived absence in the destruction of the Temple (176). Likewise, "God is *still* good to Israel" (179, italics original). Psalm 83, for Smith, "concludes the collection by embodying the resolution that each of its constituent groupings has promoted: trust in God's self-revelation" (183).

The Conflict Between Faith and Experience and the Shape of Psalms 73–83 should be read as a model of contemporary Psalms scholarship, combining both exegesis and editorial criticism. While it is less exegetical and more focused on the shared vocabulary and topics of the psalms considered, this work provides a very helpful explanation of the *Asaph* psalms. I do wonder if Smith avoids the very concern he is keen to avoid, namely, not reading too much from the collection back into each of its parts. On balance, it does not seem to say too much to conclude with Smith that "full appreciation of these psalms requires taking into account *both* levels of context" (187, italics original). I highly recommend this work.

Andrew J. Miller, Doctoral Researcher at Highlands Theological College