Editorial

The five hundredth anniversary of the reformation has given an opportunity to reflect upon its significance. Events have taken place across Europe and further afield to commemorate Luther nailing his ninety-five theses to the church door in Wittenberg. Many books have been published, articles written and conferences arranged to mark the occasion.

The ninety-five theses were posted in 1517, but Luther's lesser known theses presented in defence, at the 1518 Heidelberg Disputation, provide a more comprehensive account of his theology. Here he spoke of the theology of the cross, 'A theologian of glory, calls evil good and good evil. A theologian of the cross calls the thing what it actually is.' (21) His concern was that the enemies of Christ's cross set it aside and love and glory in their own works instead. In Christ's death the evil works of the 'old man' — the flesh — are crucified. But the enemy of the cross calls the works of the flesh 'good' and rejects Christ as the only source of works that please God.

Luther's juxtaposition of 'cross' and 'glory' is striking. Clearly he has a specific idea of 'glory' in view. He is not seeking to eliminate glory from Christian theology. It has a rightful place. There is God's glory and Christ's, the church is being transformed from one degree of glory to another and creation has its glory. Luther would not deny any of these truths. Instead he is speaking about those who seek glory apart from Christ and his cross. They are seeking a counterfeit glory, one that cannot last. Luther's contrast of the 'theologian of the cross' with the 'theologian of glory' draws our attention to the necessity of the cross in Christianity.

We can observe that suffering and glory are bonded together in Christ's life. It is only by way of the cross that Jesus rises from the dead and ascends into heaven. Notably in Luke's resurrection narrative the angels and Christ speak to the disciples *after* his suffering about *both* his suffering and glory. The gospel message was not only the victory of his resurrection, but also that he must first suffer these things (cf. Luke 24:7, 26, 46).

The same pattern is also found in the apostles' preaching. Thus, alongside Christ's resurrection and ascension, they preached his sufferings, necessary for our salvation (cf. Acts 2:36; 3:15, 18–21; 5:30–31; 10:39–40; 13:28–29; 17:3; 20:28; 26:23). This is also evident throughout the New Testament letters (cf. 1 Cor. 15:1–4; Heb. 2:9; 1 Pet. 1:11; Rev. 1:5–6). The apostles preached Christ's suffering and resurrection as both are integral to the gospel. Hence the preaching of the cross was central to both Christ's and the apostles' message. It is also essential to the gospel message today.

I came across with interest some articles marking the anniversary of the reformation in the secular press. Those I read were broadly appreciative of the reformation, recognising its achievements, expressing appreciation of the changes that resulted from it in society, the opportunities produced, liberties secured and developments that followed in art and science. Although the truth of Christ in his word lay at the heart of the reformation, this was not valued so highly in what I read.

Secularism proposes alternative ways to Christianity of dealing with suffering and pursues another glory, apart from Christ's sufferings. But today, as before, there is no lasting glory except for that which is found through Christ crucified. 'For all flesh is like grass'. The cross remains a folly to those who reject Christ. It is to be avoided. But it is also the wisdom and power of God today for salvation. Jesus instructs that the Christian life is the way of the cross. Through this path he prepares us for his glory (Luke 9:23–27; 2 Cor. 4:17).

Luther's contrast of the 'theologian of the cross' and the 'theologian of glory' is a helpful check that we are promoting the way of Christ and his cross in what we say and do. For today also, it is through Jesus' suffering that many shall be brought to glory (Heb. 2:10).

CONTRIBUTORS IN THIS NUMBER

Rev Dr John S. Ross is retired minister of Glenurquhart and Fort Augustus Free Church of Scotland. He retired in 2017 and is currently resident interim moderator for Kilmallie and Ardnamurchan Free Church of Scotland.

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

Philip D. Foster is a PhD candidate in Old Testament studies at the School of Divinity, New College, University of Edinburgh.

Rev Dr Joe Mock is ordained in the Presbyterian Church of Australia. He ministers in the Presbytery of Sydney, NSW, having spent many years as pastor and lecturer in Indonesia and Singapore.

Christopher Woznicki is a PhD candidate majoring in Systematic Theology at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California, USA.

Dr Ross's paper was presented at the Highland Church History Forum, Dingwall, 30th August 2016. The conference was organised by Highland Theological College UHI.

Professor Stewart's article was originally delivered as a short paper at the 17th Edinburgh Dogmatics Conference, 29th August 2017. The conference was organised by Rutherford House in association with the World Reformed Fellowship Theological Commission.

Feisty, Feminist and Fearless: Jane Elizabeth Waterston, Inverness's Pioneering Missionary

John S. Ross

Kilmallie and Ardnamurchan Free Church of Scotland

In a letter to a friend, Dr Neil Macvicar, superintendent of the Victoria Hospital, at Alice, in the former Cape Province of South Africa (now the Eastern Cape), told how in the late 1920s he was shopping in Adderley Street in Cape Town when he felt a hand laid lightly on his arm.

> I turned round and there was Dr Waterston. I had not seen her for some years and I was shocked to see how old she looked. Her tall vigorous figure had become frail and bent and she was leaning upon a stick. After a short conversation she went out, and, to my horror, without looking to the right or left, she walked straight into the traffic. There a wonderful thing happened. The traffic pulled sharply up, on both sides, including a tram-car which was coming down the street, and a broad lane was left in which the old lady slowly made her way across. She was known and revered by the whole city.[1]

Who was this frail old lady before whom the busy Cape Town traffic parted like the Red Sea under Moses' uplifted rod? The short answer is that she was Dr Jane Waterston (1843–1932), a former Free Church of Scotland missionary who overcame great difficulties to become South Africa's first female doctor, making a significant contribution to the physical, mental and spiritual well-being of black and white, during a time of great transition in the history of her adopted homeland. Pending a complete biography, a somewhat longer answer is offered in following pages.

INVERNESS, THE EARLY YEARS (1843–1866)

Jane Elizabeth Waterston was born into a family of entrepreneurial flair and enterprise, possessing sparks of genius tending to eccentricity. Her great-grandfather, George Waterston, founded in Edinburgh a business making sealing wax manufacturers and selling stationery which developed into the prosperous banknote printing firm of George Waterston

[1] R. H. W. Shepherd, *A South African Medical Pioneer: The Life of Neil Macvicar*, M.D., D.P.H., LL.D. (Lovedale, South Africa: The Lovedale Press, 1953), p. 173.

and Sons of Warriston Works, Edinburgh and 8 St Bride Street, London. The company survived until 2004. George married Catherine, a Sandeman whose immediate family gave its name to a well known wine shipping company, as well as the religious sect founded by John Glas, but known as Sandemanians.

Jane's father Charles was born 1808. After school he entered the world of banking and in 1838 was made the first general manager of the Caledonian Banking Company in Inverness.[2] In 1840 he married his first cousin, Agnes Webster, an unfortunate liaison with a branch of the family beset by mental problems. All Charles and Agnes' children, except Jane and her brother William, suffered from mental illness.[3] This in all probability explains Jane's professional interest in psychiatric medicine, her decision not to marry, and why she advised to her siblings to remain single.

Jane was born in Inverness on 17th February 1843, and baptised on 8th March in the Old High Church, Inverness, where her father rented a family pew. She was brought up in prosperity. At first the family occupied a spacious apartment over the newly built offices of the Caledonian Bank at 6 High Street, before moving to 'Oakland', a substantial 'gentleman's residence' on Drummond Road, in the suburbs of Inverness.

Little is recorded of Jane Waterston's early years. We know she was cared for by a nurse and educated at home by a governess, both from the village of Kiltarlity and that she completed secondary education at Inverness Royal Academy.

In appearance she was described as 'of slight physique, with handsome face, firm mouth, fine blue eyes, fair hair and complexion, with beautiful hands.'[4] A photograph in the Am Baile collection shows an attractive young woman appearing both determined and intelligent, anticipating the strength of character seen in a Cape Town portrait of the mature woman.

The Free Church of Scotland came into being in 1843, the year of Jane's birth, and by the time she was in her teens the denomination had established four congregations in Inverness.[5] Although her father was

---

2 National Library of Scotland (NLS), Edinburgh, Waterston Family Papers, 444, Acc 12235.

3 Robert Pitcairn Robertson, 1962 biographical note, National Library of Scotland, Waterston Family Papers, 446, Acc 12235. Robertson's informants were his aunt and uncle (second cousin of Jane Waterston), then aged 92 and 81 respectively.

4 Robertson, op. cit.

5 The North Church (now Church of God, Pentecostal, North Church Place), the West or Greig Street Free Church (Huntly Place); the East Church in Academy Street, and the Free High Church or St Columba's.

totally unsympathetic to the denomination, and kept up the family pew at the Old High Church, Jane, not for the last time, defied his wishes, followed her conscience, and joined the Free Church.[6] It is unclear to which of the four congregations she belonged as contemporary communion rolls and Kirk Session records are either incomplete or have become mislaid.

Jane's character showed what a family friend once called 'stern self-discipline'. She was reticent to speak about herself; her letters — edited by Lucy Bean and Elizabeth van Heyningen — reveal little of her faith or Christian experience.[7] But she was not at all unfeeling; hidden in the depths of her character were large wells of empathy. A younger Scottish contemporary, whom she may well have met in South Africa, was the writer John Buchan. He once remarked that his friend Raymond Asquith, 'disliked emotion, not because he felt lightly, but because he felt deeply.'[8] That was true of Jane Waterston.

LOVEDALE: THE TEACHER (1866–1872)

In 1821, the Glasgow Missionary Society established their first South African station among the Xhosa people. It was located on the Tyume River, beneath the Amatola Mountains, in the north of Cape Province. In 1824, the Rev John Ross opened a second station some twelve miles south-east which was named Lovedale, in memory of Dr John Love, the secretary of the mission. Lovedale was destroyed in the 1834 frontier war between the Xhosa people and the British, but rebuilt two years later a few miles further west. In 1841 a school was established there by Rev William Govan, whose first intake of students included eleven Africans and nine Europeans. From the beginning, like the keys of a piano, ebony and ivory were side by side in class and took part together in all school activities.

---

6 Apart from their nominally Sandemanian upbringing, little is known of Charles and Agnes' religious convictions. His commercial and social position may have inclined him towards reticence, though he was not against using his position to secure favours for new comers to the Auld High Kirk. On 24 July 1856, he wrote to Mrs Baillie of Dunain, a lady well established in Highland society, requesting permission for a Mr Bethune, a clergyman's son, 'recently arrived for Van Diemen's Land (Tasmania),' to take a seat in the front pew rented by her family. Cf. Letter from Mr C Waterston, Caledonian Bank to Miss Baillie of Dunain, Highland Council Archive, External ID, Z_GB232_D456_A_12_109_2. Asset ID 4968.

7 Lucy Bean and Elizabeth van Heyningen (eds), *The Letters of Jane Elizabeth Waterston, 1866–1905* (Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society, 1983).

8 John Buchan, *Memory Hold the Door* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1940), p. 66.

From 1843 to 1900 the school was under the control of the Free Church of Scotland. Govan's successor, Dr. James Stewart, who has been a member of David Livingstone's ill-fated 1862/63 Zambezi expedition, arrived in 1867, taking over the principalship in 1870.[9]

When, how and why Jane Waterston first felt herself inclined to African missionary service remains a mystery, but it is doubtless true to say that no romantic impulse prompted her, but it was rather a deep sense of spiritual duty, coupled with a strongly practical outlook, that led her to do what she believed God required of her.

Nor do we know when she first met Stewart. In August 1866 he wrote to the 23 year old inviting her to establish Lovedale's girl's boarding department. Jane's father did not consent to this venture, but as he did not stand in her way she accepted Stewart's invitation. Travelling with Stewart and his wife Mina, she arrived at Lovedale in January 1867 and threw herself into her work, learning to speak isiXhosa and developing a deep interest in and affection for African people, which remained throughout her life.

Holding a high view of women's abilities, both African and European, and not least her own, Jane was determined to use her skills and strength of character to enable her students to emerge as mature educated women, able both to build strong Christian homes and play a part in the growing Christian community. It was not in her to patronise girls by doing for them what they could do for themselves, but she fully supported them with love and respect as they strove to achieve their goal. Lovedale girls, she insisted — and few doubted it — were more highly motivated, worked harder, more quickly, and better than their male counterparts.[10]

---

9 For Stewart see James Wells, *Stewart of Lovedale: The Life of James Stewart* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910).

10 Among the many she influenced three might be mentioned.
Vertically challenged Margaret (Maggie) Majiza was looked upon by the missionaries as a child and considered too immature to know her own mind or marry. Waterston was outraged, complaining indignantly that it was quite wrong to judge Maggie's intelligence and maturity by her diminutive stature. Her support was rewarded: in 1874 Maggie became an assistant teacher and in 1877 married Elijah Makiwane, a prominent Xhosa intellectual. Their daughter, Cecilia Makiwane, was South Africa's first registered nurse — of any race — and an early activist in the struggle for women's rights. The Cecilia Makiwane Hospital in Mdantsane, Eastern Cape, is named after her.
Letitia (Letty) Ncheni, passed her entrance examination with distinction and in 1876 was invited to travel with Mrs Stewart to Scotland. Three years later, she returned to South Africa to marry and support the celebrated John Knox

Despite her enthusiastic and energetic leadership during this period, Jane Waterston's heart was not really in teaching. Although she had no doubt her life's work lay in Africa, she found herself being pulled in other directions. As she explained to James Stewart, the situation at home had become almost intolerable. The emotional instability of her mother and two sisters, their growing dependence upon medication and sherry, led to constant friction as all three teetered on the brink of mental breakdown. With her mother emotionally blackmailing Jane to come home and her father offering money for her passage, Jane saw no option but to return to Inverness to help with the needs of her dysfunctional family.[11] She resigned from Lovedale in May, 1873.

LONDON: THE MEDICAL STUDENT (1873–1880)

There was, however, more to Jane's restlessness than her home situation. Her growing conviction was that her future lay in medicine, a field hitherto closed to women. Along with this aspiration, she held unfashionably strong views about women's abilities and entitlements, was always ready to challenge any man who denied women intellectual or professional equality, and championed the case for women's suffrage a generation before the suffragettes. James Stewart tells how once a travelling companion, a medical doctor, made derogatory comments about strong-minded women being philosophers in petticoats. This Jane deeply resented, immediately contested and remained out of sorts for the rest of the journey.

In January 1874 she resigned as a Free Church missionary and after a short spell in Cape Town gaining a little medical experience, returned to Britain to become one of the first three students at the London School of Medicine for Women, with a view to return later to Africa.

Unsurprisingly, as a student she was competitive and outspokenly critical of her contemporaries, especially the head of the school, Sophia Jex-Blake, towards whom she felt a strong antipathy. She suspected, rightly as it turned out, that she was a predatory lesbian.[12] Writing frankly to James Stewart, she confessed, 'I cannot bear Jex Blake. Nature certainly

---

Bokwe, a gifted journalist, able musician, composer and hymn-writer, and an ordained Presbyterian minister.

Martha Kwatshe also completed her education in Scotland, returning to marry Mpambani Mzimba, the first black Free Church of Scotland minister and leader of an influential secession that broke away from the Free Church in 1889 to form the Presbyterian Church of Africa.

11 Cf. Bean and Van Heningen, op. cit., p. 45.

12 For Jex-Blake's lesbian predilections see e.g. Margaret Georgina Todd, *The Life of Sophia Jex-Blake* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1911), p. 65. Cf. Sharon

made a mistake in making her a woman. She wants to make friends with me and I am keeping her at arm's length.' But she also had the good grace to see some of her own faults reflected in Blake, adding, 'I will get a lot of my faults of voice and manner corrected by seeing how ugly they are in others.'[13]

Although gaining valuable clinical experience at Elizabeth Garrett Anderson's New Hospital for Women, and at the Rotunda Lying-In Hospital and the Royal Free Hospital, Jane, nevertheless, felt herself an outsider. She was convinced she was disliked by Garrett Anderson, partly because she was Scottish, but mainly because she was unwilling to do academic work on Sundays. This was not a paranoid notion. Garrett Anderson had found her own mother's evangelicalism repugnant, and had no scruples whatever about ridiculing similar convictions in others. Jane's opinion was that was 'certainly a godlessness' about her.[14]

Despite these tensions, Jane Waterston proved to be an untiring student with a reputation for hard graft. Her work was rewarded, not by the English or Scottish medical authorities who refused at that time to qualify women, but by the King and Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland. On 24th May, 1879, the *British Medical Journal* announced that she had been licensed to practice medicine and midwifery. She now applied to the Livingstonia committee of the Free Church of Scotland, to join the new work on Lake Nyasa which would seek to implement the 'Christianity and commerce' approach advocated by David Livingstone and now led by James Stewart.[15] It was to be a momentous decision.

Meanwhile, trouble had once more overtaken the Waterston family. In December 1878 the City of Glasgow Bank collapsed, undermining the Caledonian Bank, threatening the financial state of the Waterston family and straining her own finances. Jane decided to go to Inverness for the New Year, and found her mother and sisters emotionally incapacitated and her father depressed. They were glad to see her, but she refused to stay. In the following March she was relieved to hear that her father would be reinstated by the bank and the family's finances had sufficiently recouped to permit her father to send her a gift of money.[16]

Marcus, *Between Women: Friendship, Desire, and Marriage in Victorian England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), p. 46.

13 Bean and Van Heningen, *Letters*, p. 77.

14 Cf. ibid., p. 104f.

15 For Stewart's involvement in Lovedale see Wells, op. cit., p. 123ff.

16 For the 1878 banking collapse see Ashraf A. Mahate, 'Contagion Effects of Three Late Nineteenth Century British Bank Failures' in *Business and Economic History*, Vol. 23, No. 1, Fall 1994, pp. 102-15; S. G. Checkland *Scottish Banking: A History, 1695–1973* (Glasgow: Collins, 1975), p. 470.

LIVINGSTONIA: THE PIONEER MEDICAL MISSIONARY (1879–1880)

Jane Waterston's interest in becoming a doctor in Africa seems to be partly attributable to her experience at Lovedale and partly to the inspiration of David Livingstone's life. Livingstone's funeral took place in 1874, the year Jane arrived in London. There is no evidence she attended, although James Stewart was present. The event, however, generated great enthusiasm for the new Free Church project, the establishment of the memorial mission on Lake Nyasa, to be known as Livingstonia. Jane wanted to join this mission as a fully qualified doctor.

Jane Waterston's reputation having preceded her via Stewart, her application was received by the Livingstonia committee with enthusiasm.[17] She was appointed as 'female Assistant at the Mission' for 'the management of a boarding school for native girls and assistance of the medical men at the Station.'[18] The Ladies Missionary Association would underwrite her expenses.[19]

The warmth of her acceptance was, however, offset by petty restrictions placed on her activities. She was told that, 'in rendering such assistance it must in every case be understood that her position shall be subordinate to those of the regular [i.e. male] physicians.'[20] To Jane this was both unfair and offensive and would rankle with her throughout her time in Livingstonia. There were other quibbles too over her salary and outfit allowance, as well as her terms and conditions of service. From the outset ominous clouds loomed over Jane Waterston's career at Livingstonia.

Enthusiastic that the mission would operate on Livingstone's own broadminded principles, Jane nevertheless felt uneasy with attempts to combine both Presbyterians (the Free Church and Church of Scotland) and the High Church Anglicans of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa. In a letter to Stewart, she questioned the wisdom of such disparate traditions attempting to cooperate. She also warned Stewart that the mission must not be hampered by 'cooks and tinkers and […] loads of luxuries', thus hindering missionaries from establishing a close rapport with Africans. Furthermore, she feared failure unless the mission was united under a strong leader whom all respected, and argued that no one was better equipped for that than Stewart himself.[21] Her judgement proved to be sound: in the event the High Church party operated separately; the

---

17 Letters from missionaries in Livingstonia to the secretaries of the Foreign Mission Committee, 1874–1926, NLS, Acc 7876, pp. 41–43.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.

21 Bean and Van Heyningen, op. cit., p. 85.

Church of Scotland established its own work at Blantyre, and the Free Church went on to found Livingstonia. Though under the strategic supervision of Stewart, Livingstonia was to be run by a young medical officer, Dr Robert Laws, who continued in the post until 1927, thus dominating the work for fifty-two years.

The Church of Scotland mission at Blantyre struggled to get going. Poor leadership and incompetent missionaries resulted in stagnation, with no schools being opened or even services of worship held. Help was sought from the Free Church and, as a first step, Dr Stewart went up to Blantyre to assess the situation, later sending William Koyi and Mapassa Ntintili, two Xhosa missionaries from Lovedale, to lend a hand.[22]

The moral bankruptcy of Blantyre was revealed by a case of attempted petty theft in February 1878. In the wee small hours Koyi and Ntintili were awoken by thieves trying to steal their blankets. They gave chase. Ntintili caught one of the robbers, who was brought back, tried by the missionaries and sentenced to be flogged. He received a brutal 156 lashes, administered in two separate punishments.

This was but the first of a number of occasions at Blantyre when Africans were brutally beaten, in one case to death. Another was executed by firing squad. In the absence of any African or colonial authority, the missionaries had unwisely set themselves up as a force for law and order in the region. Much to the chagrin of the Church of Scotland, Andrew Chirnside, an Australian hunter and traveller, whom Jane had met when he had visited Blantyre and Livingstonia in 1879, published on his return to London an account of the atrocities in a pamphlet.[23] The ensuing controversy resulted in the dismissal or resignation of most of the Blantyre staff.[24]

Blantyre's darkness cast its pall over Livingstonia. Despite strong denials to the contrary by Stewart, Laws and the Livingstonia committee in Edinburgh, Jane Waterston's correspondence leaves us in no doubt that the Free Church mission had also submitted Africans to imprisonment and floggings. At Livingstonia there also existed a totally dark prison cell, reputedly swarming with rats, in which a young mother had been incarcerated, her unweaned child being forcibly removed from her.

---

22 Cf. T. Jack Thompson, *Touching the Heart: Xhosa Missionaries to Malawi, 1876–1888* (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 2000).

23 Andrew Chirnside, *The Blantyre Missionaries: Discreditable Disclosures* (London, 1880). A short defence was offered by Alexander Riddel, *A Reply to "The Blantyre Missionaries: Discreditable Disclosures. By Andrew Chirnside, F.R.G.S."* (London: W. Blackwood & Sons, 1880).

24 Cf. T. Jack Thompson, op. cit, pp. 68ff.

Able to judge Livingstonia's faults for herself, Waterston's reliable sources of information at Blantyre were Koyi and Ntintili, the Xhosa evangelists, who reported the harshness with which Africans were treated and how Koyi had often to act as an intermediary between the missionaries and the Africans.[25] Deeply ashamed of Livingstonia's excesses, it was not sectarianism that led her to consider Blantyre the more demoralised mission station. Although events in Nyasaland cannot be compared to the atrocities in Leopold's Belgian Congo, there is in Jane's indignation something of the sense of horror we find in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, and with more justification as Blantyre and Livingstonia were ostensibly Christian establishments.

Jane herself was now in deep turmoil, having lost confidence in the leadership at both stations.[26] She identified the fundamental problems as moral and spiritual, as she explained to Stewart:

> [The] most hateful thing about the Missions at present is that there are no conversions, that there is not a blessing on the gun, and the lash, and the prison. I was asked at London if I were going out as a Missionary with a very big gun and a very small Bible and indeed, it is the gun and not the Bible they rely on in Blantyre and even here the gun is relied on to a much larger extent than should be and they [the missionaries] are so satisfied. I am the only thorn they have got.[27]

Her unhappiness was made worse by a personality clash with Robert Laws. In December 1879 she confessed:

> I can't go to Dr Laws. He and I are so very different […] Honestly I don't see how I am to work here as we won't pull the same way.[28]

She believed Laws resented her medical qualifications or skill. She complained he never once spoke a word of encouragement to her, or thanked her for any contribution she had made, despite her shouldering a great part of the medical burden. Rather, she believed, he and his wife had poisoned the minds of others against her, making hurtful innuendos that she was only in Africa to find a husband. Yet in her tribulation she felt a grim joy as she discovered that her capacity for work far exceeded that of any of the men around her. 'It has been proved,' she crowed to Stewart, 'I can

25 Ibid., p. 9, Bean and Van Heyningen, op. cit. p. 166.
26 Ibid., p. 162.
27 Ibid., p. 165.
28 Ibid., p. 166.

work everybody here out and so I am let alone, to my great delight.'[29] But that provided sparse comfort, overall she was frustrated and disillusioned. With her faith in God shattered, her joy in serving in Nyasaland turned into 'a very apple of Sodom', she now felt ashamed be to a missionary.[30]

Then she dropped a bombshell, announcing her resignation after only four months at Livingstonia. Agreeing to go, she felt, had been a grave mistake, not because of the demands of the work, and certainly not because of the Africans among whom she worked, but because of her incompatibility with missionary colleagues and the prejudices against her. Her experience of Livingstonia had, she said:

> shattered my faith in God and man and I fear I will never recover it […] Life is no longer what it was to me and never will be again. If I come to Lovedale you will want me to conduct worship and turn up at Church and services and I can't do that at present. What I want is to be let alone and left to fight out doubts, if that be possible, and get back, not some fragments of the old belief, that is not possible, but some standing ground on which to work at the present and have some slight hope for the future. I will not sham what I don't believe for any consideration. I have got a horror of religious humbug that will last me the rest of my days. [31]

Unlike her frank letter to the sympathetic Stewart, her resignation letter to Dr Laws was brief, cautious, formal and cramped.

She left Livingstonia in April 1880 and arrived in Lovedale in mid May. Although her physical health was robust, the Stewarts knew she was deeply depressed. In James Stewart's professional opinion she was 'not at all well'. Nevertheless, by September Jane was running a small dispensary at Lovedale, the first to be opened under mission auspices in the region, and was beginning to find returning glimmers of joy among the Africans she loved.

In Edinburgh, the committee took a very dim view of her resignation. They immediately removed her name from the list of missionaries, stopped her salary and demanded she refund the full cost of her fare to

---

[29] Bean and Van Heningen, op. cit., p. 168. James Jack's history of the Livingstonia mission, endorsed by Robert Laws, treats Jane Waterston as little more than a footnote. Speaking of Mrs Laws it adds, 'She was followed the same year by Miss Waterston, L.M., from Lovedale. Both these ladies continued the work already begun; and a few months afterwards, when Miss Waterston returned to Lovedale Mrs Laws undertook the entire work herself.' James W. Jack, *Daybreak in Livingstonia: the story of the Livingstonia Mission, British Central Africa* (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1901), p. 331.

[30] Cf. Bean and Van Heningen, op. cit., pp. 162–71.

[31] Ibid., p. 168.

Central Africa, as well as the outfit allowance she had received. Without an income this was impossible. Stewart considered her treatment dishonourable, and negotiated to get the amount reduced. He and his wife showed her every kindness and arranged for her to receive a small private allowance to enable her to live in the nearby town of Alice and work at Lovedale, but the depressing burden of debt hung over her.

CAPE TOWN: THE INDISPENSABLE PHYSICIAN (1883–1932)

Towards the end of 1883 Jane Waterston moved to Cape Town to take up private medical practice. Before her departure, the Lovedale staff and students presented her with an illuminated address, signed by 136 people, appreciating her friendship and work among them, assuring her she would be missed and wishing every success in her new sphere of service. Due primarily to the Stewarts' love and care, the spiritual crisis had passed and in Cape Town she felt able to become a full communicant at St Andrew's Presbyterian Church, the centre of the Scottish community.[32]

The move to Cape Town did not mean a total break with Lovedale nor with education in Cape Colony. Dr Langham Dale, the government's Superintendent-General of education unofficially enlisted her help at a critical time when racial segregation was increasing and hostile voices were opposing African education. She threw herself wholeheartedly into the fight.

Jane Waterston bought No. 61 Plein Street, which would be her home and surgery for the next five years. As the only woman doctor in South Africa, she realised the necessity of being as up-to-date as possible in knowledge, skills and treatments. So in 1888 she sold Plein Street and

[32] Scottish Presbyterian church life in South Africa dates from 1806 when the 93rd Regiment of Foot (Sutherland Highlanders) was stationed at the Cape. As no chaplains were appointed to regiments at that time, the men on their own initiative constituted a society and elected a Kirk Session of two sergeants, two corporals and two privates. They called Rev George Thom of the London Missionary Society to be their minister in 1812 and the following year they furnished themselves with Communion silver. By 1820, under the leadership Dr John Philip the congregation became a Congregational Church and the focus of Presbyterian worship shifted to St Andrew's Church, whose foundation-stone was laid in 1827, and the church officially opened in 1829. Around the same time the Scottish missionaries of the Glasgow Missionary Society arrived on the eastern frontier of Cape Colony. Cf. David Reid, *The Kirk of the 93rd: A Short History, 1808–1868* (privately published, n.d.); Frank Quinn and Greg Cuthbertson, *Presbyterianism in Cape Town: A History of St Andrew's Church, 1829–1979* (Cape Town: St Andrew's Church, 1979).

travelled to London to prepare to be examined as a licentiate of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh. It gave her great satisfaction, to be told, somewhat patronisingly, that her papers 'were not the ordinary run they got from women students.'[33] Typically, she remarked, 'I valued that more than anything.'[34]

In June the same year she obtained the degree of Doctor of Medicine (MD) from Brussels University and in July was awarded the Certificate in Psychological Medicine from the Medico Psychological Association (MPA) of Great Britain, the first woman ever to acquire this qualification. The president of the MPA in 1888 was the chauvinistic Thomas Couston of Edinburgh who may well have been irked to announce to the Annual Meeting that 'they had granted certificate to forty-five gentlemen and one lady, all of whom had passed most satisfactory examinations.'[35]

Meanwhile in Inverness, the still struggling Caledonian Bank had withdrawn her eighty year old father's pension, and then repaid it at a reduced level of one third, thus plunging him into near penury. The thought crossed her mind that she might be obliged to remain in Britain to financially support her ageing parents, but decided that she could best serve them by returning to her practice in Cape Town. As for herself, she knew she would be better off in 'a younger country and a simpler life.' [36]

Now forty-five years old and in the prime of life, Jane Waterston returned to face the challenges of the rapidly expanding Cape Town, plagued with great disparities of wealth and poverty, largely reflecting a growing racial segregation. Poor districts were lawless and overcrowded, notorious for cramped, shoddily built properties, rented at extortionate rates, where as many as sixteen people occupied a single room. A shared earth toilet stood in the back yard. Bathing, if it took place at all, was in a galvanised bath tub on the kitchen floor. In the poorer districts there was virtually no access to medical facilities and no modern maternity help. Disease was rife and mother and infant mortality high.

Determined to address some of these needs, Dr Jane opened a Ladies' Branch of the Free Dispensary, to care for women and children. It later trained midwives and maternity nurses. To fund the dispensary, she used the profits from the high fees her wealthy private patients were able to afford.

---

33 Letter 121, Bean and Van Heyningen, op. cit., p. 210.

34 Ibid.

35 'A Hundred Years Ago — Jane Elizabeth Waterston (1843–1932)' in *Women in Psychiatry Special Interest Group Newsletter*, Royal College of Psychiatrists, June 2006.

36 Bean and Van Heyningen, op. cit., p. 212.

In 1905 she was appointed an Official Visitor to Old Somerset Hospital, South Africa's first psychiatric hospital and when seriously disturbed psychiatric patients and leprosy sufferers were transferred to Robben Island, she became an Official Visitor. She was also appointed president of the Cape of Good Hope (Western) Branch of the British Medical Association. In 1910 she joined the Cape Provincial Hospital Board, and in 1916 was given a seat on the board of the Valkenberg Mental Hospital.

Elizabeth van Heyningen portrays a busy Dr. Jane going about her work:

> For more than thirty years, black medical bag in hand, Jane Waterston was a familiar visitor to the poorer streets of Cape Town as she tramped to confinements with a friendly smile for everyone […] She did not use a pony trap or later a car. The trams, occasionally a Hansom horse cab, and her sturdy, black booted feet sufficed.[37]

Right up into her eighties she took an early morning swim in the sea at Muizenberg, whatever the weather, and at least annually climbed Table Mountain. The three hour expedition invariably started by her removing her long skirt to reveal beneath a pair of tweed plus-fours. Not only did she exercise regularly, but she ate frugally. A friend noted her Spartan diet:

> She never eats at all hardly. A cup of tinned coffee and milk and slice of Boerbread for Breakfast; a spoonful or two of tinned fruit, or of cornflour pudding for luncheon, and a cup of tea and biscuit at 4 o'clock in the afternoon is all she eats; she never has dinner […][38]

Independent and eccentric, she did not care a fig what people thought about her. In a letter home, in 1896, her young friend, the *Cape Times* editor Edmund Garrett, described her as the 'Silly, nice, unreasonable, absurd, excellent, indispensable Physician!'[39]

Women colleagues could find her difficult to work with. Travelling with her by train to Johannesburg, Lucy Deane complained:

> We were to have had a lovely lie-a-bed morning, breakfast not till 8.a.m., Alas! at 5.30 I was waked by a vigourous [sic] thump on my door and Dr. Waterston's cheerful voice in strong Scotch: "Miss Deane, I've begged a pail

---

37 Bean and Van Heyningen, op. cit., p. 253.

38 Elizabeth van Heyningen, *Dr Jane Elizabeth Waterston (1843–1932)*, paper given at the Van Riebeeck Society Summer School in 2009.

39 Fydell Edmund Garrett *The Garrett Papers* (Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society, 1984), p. 84.

> real hot water for you from an Engine-driver, make haste dear and seize the chance of a real bath before the shunting begins at six!" I could have killed the dear friendly old lady! She is extraordinary. Never tired, never hungry, never quiet.[40]

She staunchly opposed republicanism and supported Imperialism, under which she felt black people would get a much better deal than in an independent South Africa. Nor was she afraid to make such opinions public. Her house stood in Parliament Street, the only privately owned property, entirely surrounded by government buildings. When in the late 1920s there were plans to abandon the British flag in favour of a tricolour with horizontal stripes of orange, white and blue, she had the red, white and blue Union Flag flown in protest from a flag pole in her garden.[41] In 2015 the flag, along with her brass plate, was discovered on the old Lovedale premises and donated to The Amathole Museum in King William's Town, South Africa.

After all the agonising personal, academic and professional struggles of earlier days, in later years Dr Jane was highly regarded. Honours were showered upon her. Her Cape Town contemporary, Dr Christian Lawrence Herman, said that 'As a physician she had few equals, and her advice was much valued. She was quick in her decisions; sound and reliable in her view, she was of great help in consultations, where her opinion were alway clearly and concisely expressed.'[42] In 1919 she was presented with an illuminated address, a letter-case and a cheque, acknowledging her medical, social and missionary work during half a century, and paying tribute to her unceasing Christlike attempts 'to lift up the fallen, to succour the poor and downtrodden, and to bring comfort and healing to the homes of misery and distress.'[43] In 1925 Dr. Jane was elected a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Ireland, only the second woman to achieve the honour, and in 1929 made an honorary Doctor of Laws of the University of Cape Town.

In the early summer of 1932 Dr Jane's health declined critically and she was at last confined to bed. A fortnight later she lost consciousness and on Monday 7th of November, at 3.20pm, she slipped away to her eternal home. She was 89. One obituarist said, 'Death came to her but gently, as if in love.' After the funeral service at St Andrew's Church, her mile

---

40 van Heyningen, op. cit.

41 Robertson, op. cit.

42 Christian Lawrence Herman, 'Obituary: Jane Waterston M.D., LL.D., F.R.C.P.' in South African Medical Journal, Volume 6, Issue 22, Nov 1932, pp. 742–44.

43 Anon. 'Death notice: Dr Jane Waterston', in South African Medical Journal, Volume 6, Issue 21, Nov 1932, pp. 683–84.

long funeral cortège wound its way to Woltemade Cemetery, No. 1, where an 'immense concourse' of dignitaries gathered at her graveside to pay tribute.

CONCLUSION

Through a quiet, rarely articulated, but steadfast faith in God, Jane Waterston was enabled to rise above the many grave challenges that beset her. She doggedly tackled the societal restrictions placed upon Victorian women, graciously deflected the selfish expectations of her family, determinedly defied the pretensions of colleagues in the Free Church mission in Nyasaland, winsomely overcame resentment in the male-dominated Cape Town medical fraternal, and withstood the growing illiberal racism endemic in the South Africa of her day.

Those who mourned her passing were drawn from all parts of South African society, from Ministers of the Crown to Xhosa dockyard workers, who, in their own ways, remembered this intelligent, intrepid, pioneering, determined, courageous woman, who as a compassionate and skilled doctor contributed so much to the wellbeing of others. But Jane Waterston was so much more the sum of all these very considerable parts. To all her gifts must be added the Christian graces of love and self-denial, which we note less for our admiration and more for our emulation.

Jane Waterston's love knew no barriers of gender, race or class. In 1929, Sir John Carruthers Beattie, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cape Town, in conferring on her an honorary degree, bore her this testimony, 'She has been a jealous fighter for the prestige of the medical and nursing professions but the most authentic record of her life work will be found written in the annals of the poor, by whom her deeds of mercy will be long remembered.'[44]

An outstanding example of the second was her immediate and instinctive response to the news brought in by an African runner, that away in the bush of Central Africa, the colonial Herbert Rhodes, older brother of Cecil J. Rhodes, had been very seriously burned by an accidental fire which had taken hold of his tent. Without hesitation, with no thought for herself and with minimal rest or refreshment on the way, she set out from Livingstonia to walk the truly perilous two hundred miles, but arrived too late to save his life.[45]

---

[44] Cited by Anon. 'Jane Waterston: a Pioneer Missionary', in The South African Outlook, December 1st, 1932, p. 231.

[45] Ibid.

Little wonder the Xhosa people, noting the springy, bouncing gait of the enthusiastic young Jane, named her *Noqakata* (mother of activity), but they always coupled her activity to her Christlike, selfless love. Jane Waterston, animated by God's love, followed her Saviour wherever he led and like him 'went around doing good.'[46]

[46] Acts 10.38.

Somewhere Between Zurich and Geneva? The Stance of Reformation Scotland in 1560

Kenneth J. Stewart

Covenant College, Lookout Mountain, Georgia, USA

INTRODUCTION: IDENTIFYING THE LOYALTIES OF SCOTLAND'S EARLY REFORMATION

Between the spring of 1560 and the close of 1562, the leaders of the emergent Protestant Church of Scotland prepared three major standards that would guide its life during the following decades. These were first, a "Book of Reformation," a scheme for the renovation of the un-reformed church into a national Protestant Church; we know it now as the *First Book of Discipline*. Second, and better known, was the *Scots Confession*, produced on short notice by a committee of six men, all of whom shared the first name, John. Third came the "Forme of Prayers," the service-book ratified in 1562 and soon after known as the *Book of Common Order*. Given the extreme scarcity of Protestant leaders in 1560 (one recent estimate puts it that there were not more than twelve Protestant ministers in the entire land in 1560)[1] the question may fairly been asked, 'How could this early theological and ecclesiastical output have been so substantial?'

At least since the publication of Peter Hume Brown's biography of John Knox in 1895, answers to this question have alleged slavish imitation. Hume Brown asserted that the theological stance of the Scottish Reformation in 1560 was essentially that of John Calvin. In the *Knox* biography, Hume Brown wrote:

> To all intents and purposes, it [the Scots Confession] is a mere compendium of Calvinistic theology in the fully developed form it had assumed in Calvin's later days.[2]

So pervasive did Hume Brown take this Genevan influence to be that he argued that the *Confession of Faith* and *Book of Discipline* could still have made their appearance in Scotland in 1560 even if Knox himself had never returned.[3]

---

1 Robert M. Healey, 'The Preaching Ministry in Scotland's *First Book of Discipline*', *Church History* 58.3 (1989), 343.

2 Peter Hume Brown, *John Knox*, 2 vols. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1895), II, 122.

3 Brown, *John Knox*, II, 122, 123.

Just as dogmatic in tone was the mid-twentieth century opinion of Maurice Taylor. In contributing to a Roman Catholic analysis of the Scottish events of 1560, he opined that John Knox — a Zwinglian until his fleeing England after Mary Tudor's accession to the throne of England in 1553 — thereafter came 'under the influence of Calvin'.[4] His return to Scotland in 1559, issuing in the rapid acceptance of a Confession of Faith and Book of Discipline, represented 'Calvinism in Scotland made official, explicit and complete'.[5]

According to such writers, the stance of the Scottish Reformed Church — as displayed in these three forms — was the manifestation of wholesale borrowing. Calvin, either speaking alone, or like a ventriloquist speaking through Knox, had supplied the Scottish reform movement with its ideology. We move only incrementally beyond this outlook when we consider the view of the latest biographer of Knox, who in a 2009 essay recorded the opinion that these materials of the 1560–62 period showed that:

> Knox and [his associate] Goodman brought to Scotland a 'start-up' kit for the new Kirk which would prove to be of greater significance than their experience as ministers in Geneva […] After its short and revolutionary crisis in 1559–60, the Scottish Kirk was fortunate to have to hand a package of key texts and a model of how to run a church which had been road-tested by the English-speaking exile congregation in Geneva.[6]

On this view, it was not so much Calvin himself, but the 'laboratory' of Knox's exile congregation at Geneva, which was the spring from which all the productions of 1560–1562 flowed. The origination remains foreign; the mediators of the influence of Calvin and Geneva are the ministers of Geneva's refugee congregation.

---

4 Maurice Taylor, 'The Conflicting Doctrines of the Scottish Reformation' in David McRoberts, ed. *Essays on the Scottish Reformation* (Glasgow: Burns, 1962), p. 256.

5 Ibid., p. 259.

6 Jane Dawson, 'Scotland and the Example of Geneva' in *Theology in Scotland* 16.2 (2009), 64, 68. She argues similarly in 'Knox, Goodman and the Example of Geneva' in Patrick Collinson and Polly Ha, eds. *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 107–35. The same sentiments are expressed in Dawson's *John Knox* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), p. 192. A similar conception of heavy indebtedness to Geneva is set out in detail in James Kirk, *Patterns of Reform* (Edinburgh: St Andrew Press, 1989), chap. 3, 'The Calvinist Contribution to the Scottish Reformation'. To be fair, Kirk's concern is to account for developments well beyond 1562.

I hope the reader will grasp the difficulty of maintaining such opinions today. The difficulty lies not in what these writers affirmed (the importance of foreign antecedents and of the powerful example of Calvin), but in what they omitted (factors closer to home). We should acknowledge that something like these opinions lives on in the popular Protestantism that clings to a kind of 'Calvin's Geneva *ü*ber alles' notion of the utter dominance of that city and that Reformer in the advance of Reformed Protestantism.[7]

We return to the question, 'How may we account for the primary documents of Reformation Scotland in 1560–1562, the period of the Parliamentary establishment of Protestantism?' In what follows we will consider several strands of evidence indicating that Reformation Scotland 1560–1562 followed a much more eclectic theological approach. There are three major considerations.

I. INTERACTIONS WITH SUCCESSIVE WAVES OF REFORMIST THOUGHT

Commencing with the Lollards, Scotland experienced successive waves of reformist thought. Each phase of reformist thought had representatives still on the scene to interact with developments which followed. We consider Lollard, Lutheran, Anglican, Helvetic, Erasmian and Genevan waves.

Lollard

Both because of the enrolment of Scottish students at Oxford University from 1357 onward (Oxford being a stronghold of John Wycliffe's teaching) and because of the migration of English Lollards into Scotland to avoid ensuing persecution, this medieval dissenting movement came to be associated with various Scottish regions.[8] After 1400, there were allegations made against various persons claimed to have declared Lollard

[7] The notion of the dominance and pervasiveness of Calvin and Geneva's collective influence in the British Reformations found classic expression in the 1949 work of Charles Davis Cremeans, *The Reception of Calvinist Thought in England* (Urbana, IL, University of Illinois Press, 1949). It finds popular expression today through the labours of popular Christian communicators such as John Piper. See his 2012 video of Calvin's Geneva here: <http://www.desiringgod.org/articles/after-darkness-light-video-from-geneva>.

[8] The persistence of Lollardy into the Reformation era and its links with the new movements is discussed in Margaret Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984), chap. 7.

opinions. In Lanarkshire, the focus of attention was Quintin Folkhyrde;[9] by 1407 James Resby was executed for Lollardy at Perth.[10] The need to counteract Lollard heresy provided a justification for the foundation of the University of St Andrews in 1410. That same city was the site of the execution of another person of similar persuasion in 1439: a Moravian Hussite, Paul Kraver (or Crawar) who was in Scotland soliciting support for his Moravian (Hussite) cause in advance of the Council of Basel. [11]

Yet by the 1490s, what had been until then a sporadic chain of occurrences gained greater visibility. Thirty persons were arrested in Ayrshire in 1494 for their Lollard opinions, a summary of which has been preserved.[12] Friends in high places ensured that the ecclesiastical trial, which took place before King James IV, did not result in a guilty verdict. The Lollard sympathizers were released with an admonition.[13] Now this admitted trace comes suddenly into clearer focus in connection with the career of a particular Ayrshire man: Murdoch Nisbet (d. ca. 1545). Raised in this milieu of sympathy for Lollard opinions, he fled Scotland sometime after 1513 and in a long absence produced a Scots rendering of a Lollard New Testament.[14] On examination, this New Testament — derived from the improved Lollard version of John Purvey — also reflects familiarity with William Tyndale's first English New Testament of 1525 and the completion of Tyndale's work by Coverdale in 1535. Its prefaces demonstrate familiarity with the writings of Luther, which had begun to circulate in Scotland after 1522.[15] Nisbet is estimated to have returned to Scotland by the early 1530s.[16] The production of his New Testament at

9 Folkhyrde's activity is detailed in Martin Dotterweich, 'The Emergence of Early Evangelical Theology in Scotland to 1550' (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2002), pp. 19–25.

10 W.S. Reid, 'The Lollards in Pre-Reformation Scotland', *Church History* 11.4 (1942), 269–70.

11 Reid, 272. Further details are supplied by Ian B. Cowan in an article, 'Paul Kravar' in Nigel M. de S. Cameron, ed. *Scottish Dictionary of Church History and Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), p. 466.

12 Gordon Donaldson, ed. *Scottish Historical Documents* (Glasgow: Scottish Academic Press, 1974), p. 90.

13 Reid, 281. Margaret H.B. Sanderson, *Ayrshire and the Reformation* (East Linton, East Lothian: Tuckwell, 1997), chap. 4.

14 Sanderson, *Ayrshire*, p. 42.

15 Sanderson, pp. 42, 43. Dotterweich, 'The Emergence of Early Evangelical Theology', pp. 56–57 details the existence of two Wycliffite Bibles from this era.

16 The Nisbet N.T. appeared in a 19th century edition prepared by T.G. Laws and published as *The New Testament in Scots* 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1901). Assessments of the Nisbet N.T. were provided by T.M. Lindsay, 'A Lit-

such a time effectively demonstrates the way in which one early pre-Reformation movement was giving way to a later. And that later movement, Lutheranism, was beginning to make its presence felt in Scotland from the early 1520s onward.

Lutheran

The fact that in 1525, the Scottish parliament made explicit reference to 'the heretic Luther' as the source of 'dampnable opinyeonis' circulating in the land, provides a clear indicator that the German reformer's influence had been detected.[17] We have seen that Murdoch Nisbet had absorbed enough of Luther's teaching that it was reflected in his Lollard-Scots New Testament. But even before Nisbet could do that, there was the fact that scores of Scottish students were studying at Paris and Cologne in the years following the launch of Luther's protest. In such cities, the leading ideas of Luther circulated widely. No less than twelve Scots are known to have studied in Wittenberg in this period.[18] And the literature which such students encountered abroad soon began to arrive surreptitiously in the east-coast Scottish ports of Aberdeen, Montrose, Dundee, Edinburgh and Leith.[19]

Patrick Hamilton (1504–1528) was one of the many Scottish students who studied in Paris and later — upon his first being suspected of heresy at St Andrews — at Wittenberg and Marburg. At his return, he influenced a second Scot and St Andrews student, Alexander Alane (or Alesius) before his own martyrdom.[20] Doctrinal theses, composed by Hamilton at Wittenberg, were translated into English after Hamilton's death by the English proto-reformer, John Frith in 1529 as "Patrick's Places". Here was a clear example of Lutheran-style teaching on justification by faith, composed by a Scot, circulating clandestinely on both sides of the bor-

---

erary Relic of Scottish Lollardy', *Scottish Historical Review* 1 (1904), 260–90, and T.M.A. MacNabb, 'The New Testament in Scots', *Records of the Scottish Church Historical Society*, 11 (1951), 82–103.

17 Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, II. 295 as excerpted in Donaldson, *Scottish Historical Documents*, pp. 102, 103.

18 James Kirk, 'The Religion of Early Scottish Protestants' in James Kirk, ed. *Humanism and Reform: The Church in Europe, England and Scotland 1400–1643* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), p. 374.

19 W.S. Reid, 'Lutheranism in the Scottish Reformation', *Westminster Theological Journal* 7 (1945), 95.

20 Iain R. Torrance, 'Patrick Hamilton' in the Nigel M. de S. Cameron, ed. *Scottish Dictionary of Church History and Theology*, pp. 390, 391. The advance of evangelical conviction in this period within St Andrews is described by Dotterweich, 'The Emergence of Evangelical Theology', pp. 174–75.

der.[21] Both by the powerful example of his martyrdom and through his disciple, Alesius, he furthered Lutheran influence in Scotland.[22] Alesius, himself a St Andrews graduate, went into exile in 1530 and then served the Lutheran cause, ultimately as professor of theology at Leipzig.

That the Lutheran phase of Scotland's reform was not abruptly ended by Hamilton's martyrdom and the flight of Alesius is illustrated by at least two evidences. First, another St Andrews graduate, John Gau, having imbibed Lutheran teaching, went into exile in Sweden and from there, sent back into Scotland a book which he had translated from Danish, *The Richt Vay to the Kingdom of Hevine*; this embraced a Lutheran understanding of salvation by faith.[23] This, having been smuggled into the country by North Sea merchants, was dispersed across Scotland. Similarly, there circulated within Scotland from about 1540 the writings associated with John Wedderburn, the *Gude and Godlie Ballades*. John Wedderburn had been exposed to Lutheran ideas while at St Andrews, had likely witnessed the execution of Hamilton in that place and fled to Lutheran Saxony circa 1539.[24] Critical to our purpose here, we can note that the oldest surviving bound edition of what had earlier circulated in broadsheet form is that of 1567. As this was seven years following the parliamentary establishment of Protestantism, the publication serves as a demonstration of the ongoing existence of Lutheran sentiments in an era when Scottish Protestantism is reckoned to have moved on to embrace new emphases.

Such Lutheran influences continued to exert influence in the post-1560 era also through individuals who, having fled Scotland earlier in

---

21 James Kirk, 'The Religion of Early Scottish Protestants', p. 375.

22 A.F.S. Pearson, 'Alexander Alesius and the English Reformation', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 10 (1949), 57–87; John T. McNeil, 'Alexander Alesius, Scottish Lutheran', *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte* 55 (1964), 161–91; G. Wiedermann, 'Alexander Alesius: Lectures on the Psalms at Cambridge, 1536', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986), 15–41. *Patrick's Places* are reprinted as an appendix in William Croft Dickinson, ed. *John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950), II.

23 James Kirk, 'John Gau' in Nigel M. de. S. Cameron, ed. *Scottish Dictionary of Church History and Theology*, p. 352. Gau's book was edited and prepared for publication by A.F. Mitchell and issued by the Scottish Text Society in 1888. A wider range of this Lutheran-oriented literature is surveyed in James K. Cameron, 'Aspects of the Lutheran Contribution to the Scottish Reformation', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 22.1 (1984), 1–12.

24 Iain Ross, ed. *The Gude and Godlie Ballatis* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1939). A full critical edition was produced by A.F. Mitchell for the Scottish Text Society in 1897. It is not entirely clear whether the *Ballades* are the collaborative work of three Wedderburn brothers, or the solo project of one.

periods of persecution returned to Scotland from Lutheran territories. The eventual Protestant minister of Dundee, William Christison, returned to that city in 1560 having served previously at Bergen, Norway. William Ramsay, a 1545 St Andrews graduate, went directly to Wittenberg upon graduation and returned in 1560 to join the faculty of St Salvator's College, St Andrews.[25] These transitions from Lutheran territory into the Reformed Church of Scotland seem to have involved no significant hurdles for those returning.

Anglican

The death of King James V after the Battle of Solway Moss in 1542 exposed Scotland to a period of political instability. As a short-term remedy, Scotland entrusted the role of head of state to a regent, the second Earl of Arran. During this regency, King Henry VIII made diplomatic overtures to secure a marriage between his only son, the future Edward VI, and Mary, daughter to the late King James V.[26] Regent Arran was at that time amenable both to this proposal and to the English promotion of cross-border Protestantism. In this period, by English initiative, Tyndale New Testaments became readily available in Scotland. The English promotion of Protestantism in Scotland did not continue to enjoy Scottish state support once Arran returned to his earlier Catholic allegiance. Yet for an initial period following 1543, Bibles and Christian literature in English became available as never before in Scotland.

Conversely, Scottish proto-Protestants needing to evade prosecution readily found refuge in neighbouring England in these decades.[27] The English initiatives meant to advance Protestantism in Scotland were renewed in the reign of English king Edward VI. From 1549 onward, the initial First Prayer Book of Edward and — after 1552 — the Second Prayer Book came into wide use in Scotland, a usage which persisted into the post-1560 period.[28]

---

25 James K. Cameron, 'Aspects of the Lutheran Contribution to the Scottish Reformation', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 22.1 (1984), 2.

26 This era, which began with poised diplomatic initiatives descended into cross-border invasions in the 'Rough Wooing' period. See Jenny Wormald, *Court, Kirk and Community: Scotland 1475–1625* (London, Edward Arnold, 1981), pp. 103–04.

27 Wormald, p. 103. Among those fleeing into England were John Spottiswoode, John McAlpine, George Wishart and John Willock. John Knox did not find refuge in England until 1549.

28 By 1557, the use of the Second Prayer Book seems to have become normative in the underground Protestant congregations in Scotland. See Dickinson, ed.

The Swiss/Helvetic Turn

Not because Lutheranism had somehow disappeared from Scotland (Scottish students continued to frequent Lutheran university theological faculties into the 1550s), but because of the heightened role played by the Reform movements in the Swiss cantons by the 1530s, it was only to be expected that Reformation emphases sounded among the Swiss would manifest themselves in Scotland. Zurich had come to distinguish itself as the nurturer of Reform movements first in other German-speaking and then French regions of the Confederation. Those Swiss influences were meanwhile also making an impression in Scotland's neighbour to the south. English Protestant dissidents had begun to gravitate to Zurich, especially after Henry VIII's Act of Six Articles (1539).[29] No Church of England figure was more attentive to Zurich than future bishop John Hooper.

The future Scottish martyr, George Wishart (c.1513–1546) would encounter Zurich in this period and while there came to be on friendly terms with Heinrich Bullinger, the successor to Zwingli.[30] A graduate of Aberdeen and Louvain, Wishart had initially returned from the Low Countries to Montrose, Scotland to teach Greek until hounded out of Scotland by the Bishop of Brechin in 1538.[31] The next years saw him in Bristol, where once more he ran afoul of the religious authorities. He crossed over to the Continent and was associated for a time with Zurich and Heinrich Bullinger and then returned for a period of lecturing at Cambridge University.[32] By 1543, he was in Scotland preaching as an itinerant.[33] By 1546, Wishart was apprehended and tried for heresy; his preaching is said to have 'popularized the doctrines of the Swiss Reformers in Scotland'.[34]

John Knox's History of the Reformation, i, 137 and fn. 7. See also James Kirk, *Patterns of Reform* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), p. 12.

29 Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry the Eighth: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 178.

30 An explanation of how he came to possess the 1536 Helvetic Confession in original Latin version, direct from Bullinger, and well in advance of any European publication, is provided by Ian Hazlett in the Martin H. Dotterweich, ed. *George Wishart Quincentennial Proceedings* (n.p.: www.wishart.org, 2014), pp. 23–24.

31 Martin Holt Dottereich, 'George Wishart in England' in Dottereich, ed. *George Wishart*, p. 26.

32 Gottfried W. Locher, *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 1984), p. 372.

33 James Kirk, 'George Wishart' in the Nigel M. de S. Cameron, ed. *Scottish Dictionary of Church History and Theology*, p. 877.

34 James Kirk, 'George Wishart', *SDCHT*, p. 877.

After his execution at St Andrews, there was published from within England his translation of the *First Helvetic Confession* (1536). This confession, never before published at its release in England c. 1548, displayed a collaborative Swiss Reformed theology determined to speak in as great harmony as possible with the Lutheran position in light of opposition from Holy Roman Empire and Papacy.[35] The translation serves as a kind of mirror of Wishart's own theological position in the 1540s.

On the basis of this known Zurich connection, Wishart's theological position has been mislabelled as 'Zwinglian'. And since John Knox came into close and prolonged relationship with Wishart in the years of his itinerant preaching in Scotland, the designation, 'Zwinglian' has been used to describe his own theological outlook in the late 1540s. But clearly, in such references the term, 'Zwinglian' is being used anachronistically (and pejoratively) for it was Bullinger as the figurehead of the ongoing Zurich Reformation who was now giving theological direction. It was this emphasis that Knox's eventual colleague, John Willock (preaching as a Scots refugee in England from 1540 onward) found in pro-Protestant preachers Latimer, Hooper, and Ridley; Willock encountered it also in the Swiss student of theology at Oxford, John ab Ulmis, and the superintendent of the London 'Strangers Churches', John á Lasco.[36] At the accession of Catholic Queen Mary Tudor, Willock went not to Frankfurt, Zurich or Strasbourg (some of the better-known destinations of refugees), but followed á Lasco to Emden where he ministered, under á Lasco's supervision, to an English refugee congregation.

The theological orientation of the Protestant churches at Emden was clearly that of Zwingli and Bullinger.[37] From Emden, John Willock went into Scotland in 1555 (ostensibly on a diplomatic errand). He never returned to Emden from this diplomatic errand but became a chief preacher in Scotland's underground Protestant movement that was gathering strength in the period leading to 1559–60. It is important to note, however, an almost certain decline of the theological influence of Bullinger and Zurich after 1560. The support lent by Bullinger in that period to the retention both of episcopacy and of distinctive clerical garb in the

---

35 Ian Hazlett, 'George Wishart and the Swiss Confession of Faith' in Martin H. Dotterweich, ed., *George Wishart Quincentennial Conference Proceedings* (n.p.: www.wishart.org, 2014), p. 22.

36 Duncan Shaw, 'John Willock' in Duncan Shaw, ed. *Reformation and Revolution: Essays Presented to Hugh Watt* (Edinburgh: St Andrew Press, 1967), pp. 50–51.

37 Shaw, 'John Willock', p. 51.

Church of England caused him to be perceived to be working at cross purposes to the priorities of the Scottish Church.[38]

Erasmian Humanism

Having acknowledged the growing influence of Zurich for both English and Scottish reformation movements, the stage would seem to be set for a discussion of the influence of Calvin and of Geneva. Yet doing so at this point would leave unaddressed what would otherwise remain a giant riddle. That under-acknowledged factor is the late-emerging support for the Reformation in the half-decade leading to 1560 by those who — almost until the last minute — had maintained outward support for Scottish Catholicism because they sincerely harboured the desire to see Scriptural reform advance in that church. Such an emphasis was encouraged at Aberdeen University in the period up to 1540. Still more students were encouraged in this direction at St Andrews.[39] Let us refer to specific persons.

John Erskine of Dun, a St Andrews graduate, was never ordained in the pre-Reformation Church. But this laird knew the Scriptures and had hosted George Wishart in his home in 1543; he threw in his lot with the cause of Reform in 1555 and eventually (post-1560) became the Reformed superintendent of Angus and Mearns. The illegitimate son of the late king, James V (and therefore, half-brother to Mary Queen of Scots) was another such person: Lord James Stewart (c.1531–1570). Embodying in his own biography the compromise and complexity of the pre-Reformation church, he had been made head (prior) of the Augustinian priory at St Andrews at age eight; he filled this leadership role without ever subsequently taking monastic vows. He took a course of studies in St Andrews University; functioning as prior he had begun to take his place in the series of reforming councils summoned by the Scottish Catholic hierarchy in an attempt to pre-empt the growing criticisms of the rising Protestant movement. John Winram (c.1492–1582), the sub-prior of that same Augustinian monastery at St Andrews, was himself a theological graduate of the university, read Greek, and was early-on familiar with continental Reformation thought. With his Augustinian superior (Stewart), Winram embraced the Reformation in 1559. He rapidly became the Protestant superintendent of Fife. Another St Andrews dignitary, John Douglas (c.1494–1574), rector of St Mary's College, joined the Reformation cause

[38] Bruce Gordon, 'Peter Martyr Vermigli in Scotland' in Emidio Campi, ed. *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation* (Genéve: Librairie Droz, 2002), pp. 284, 285.

[39] James Kirk, 'The Religion of Early Scottish Protestants', pp. 362, 363.

in 1560. John Carswell (d. 1572), another St Andrews graduate, threw his support behind the Reformation when his patron, the Earl of Argyll, did so. John Row (1525–1580), a St Andrews graduate, went on to distinction in canon law. He returned to Scotland from Rome in 1559 and threw in his lot with the by-then returned John Knox.

As one looks beneath the surface, one finds in many such cases the common elements of the university study of Greek (prior to the 1550s, available only on the Continent),[40] access to Erasmus' *Annotations on the New Testament* (1519, revised through 1535), linkage with either King's College, Aberdeen or the colleges comprising St Andrews, and some familiarity with continental Reformation theology. Those who had travelled such paths gradually developed aspirations for the purification of the church and the restoration of her teaching ministry. These aspirations were left unfulfilled by the faltering efforts of the Scottish Catholic reforming councils of 1549, 1552 and 1559. The type of aspirations they harboured and the distance that they had already travelled in a reforming direction were exhibited in a production of 1552 which bore the name, "Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism".[41] This was so informed by Christian humanist aspirations that it de-emphasized the role of the Papacy and supported the concept of salvation appropriated by faith. [42]

All these individuals had lived through the Lutheran-tinged era of Patrick Hamilton; a good number had witnessed the death of George Wishart. They approached 1560 as men honestly seeking reform, yet without embracing it as exemplified by Lollardy, by Patrick Hamilton or George Wishart. Yet, a range of these individuals instantly took their

---

40 Alec Ryrie, *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor-Stewart Realms 1485–1603*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2017), p. 62. Carol Edington in an essay 'Knox and the Castillians' in Roger Mason, ed. *John Knox and the Reformation* (Brookfield, VT.: Ashgate, 1998), p. 31 has drawn attention to various non-clerics such as David Lindsay who shared these same Erasmian characteristics.

41 James Kirk, 'John Hamilton' in Nigel M. de S. Cameron, ed. *Scottish Dictionary of Church History and Theology*, p. 390, proposes English Dominican at St Mary's College, St Andrews, Richard Marshall, as true author.

42 J.H.S. Burleigh, 'The Scottish Reforming Councils, 1549 to 1559', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 11.3 (1953), pp. 189–211. A Roman Catholic appraisal of these enclaves is offered by Thomas Winning, 'Church Councils in Sixteenth Century Scotland' in David McRoberts, ed. *Essays in the Scottish Reformation* (Glasgow: Burns, 1962). A critical edition of Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism was edited by A.F. Mitchell (Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1882).

places in 1560 as framers of the Confession of Faith and the perfecting of the *First Book of Discipline*.

Calvin and Geneva

Nothing should be said or written which diminishes the hospitality of Calvin and Geneva towards the refugees associated with John Knox. These had initially encountered conflict when they had tried to secure at Frankfurt the same type of nonconforming Anglican worship that they had insisted upon in Edwardian England. It was not predominantly a Scottish group of exiles that left Frankfurt for Geneva in 1556; the majority of the members of the eventual refugee congregation at Geneva would return to their native England after Elizabeth's ascending to the throne at Mary's death in 1558. At their return to England, they would contend (just as at Geneva) for the sustaining of the same nonconforming way of worshipping God we would associate with the later Puritan movement. But as for Scotland? The Scottish contingent leaving Geneva at the death of Mary Tudor consisted of Knox and his English-born wife with Knox's co-pastor, Christopher Goodman — the Englishman who was just as much loathed by Queen Elizabeth as she loathed Knox, the Scot. Both had gone into print opposing the rule of women and affirmed the right of godly citizens to seek the overthrow of tyrants.

Goodman would join Knox in advancing the Reformation in Scotland (Goodman going to St Andrews, Knox to Edinburgh). And yes, these went to Scotland with their Genevan service book (the Form of Prayers) a part of which was Calvin's "Geneva Catechism," a manual of congregational discipline, and a collection of metrical psalms. They went to Scotland facing imminent peril, rather like the missionary theological graduates who would cross from Geneva to enter France and the Low Countries. But the point to take away is that the two preachers lately of Geneva crossed to Scotland, there to join an eclectic team of co-belligerents who had come to Reformation convictions by a variety of routes. Calvin (and Geneva's) influence in Scotland would grow exponentially in years to come; but in 1560 these were far from dominant influences.[43]

[43] Bruce Gordon, 'Peter Martyr Vermigli in Scotland' in Emidio Campi, ed. *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation* (Genève: Librairie Droz, 2002), p. 280.

II. THIS RANGE OF DIVERSITY WAS REFLECTED IN THE COMMITTEE OF SIX MEN, ALL NAMED 'JOHN'

Let us recapitulate what has been observed as we considered the various 'waves' of Reformation thought which had already impacted Scotland by considering how this diversity was reflected in the committee of six which produced first the "Booke of Reformation" and (subsequently) a Confession of Faith on such short notice.

Three (John Knox, John Willock, and John Spottiswoode) had served the Edwardian Church of England when they fled south in times of Scottish persecution. Of these, Spottiswoode was actually ordained in the Church of England. Willock, having in the Edwardian period obtained a Church of England pastoral benefice in Leicestershire, returned to it in 1569 at the conclusion of his extended service in Scotland. Knox himself had preached extensively in London and in the northeast of England.[44] All three — refugees in England — were familiar with the Edwardian Books of Common Prayer and had agreed to use them — if only on some modified basis.[45] Both Willock and Knox had also been exposed (both in England and on the Continent) to European-style Reformed patterns as illustrated in the ministries of John á Lasco and John Calvin. Their pre-1560 undercover ministries in Scotland will have represented a blend of these native and foreign influences.

The additional three men who co-deliberated with Knox, Willock and Spottiswoode on the Book of Reformation (First Book of Discipline) and Confession of Faith (John Douglas, John Row, and John Winram) together represented the more Erasmian route to a break with Rome. Row had been a distinguished canon lawyer who represented the pre-Reformation church as far afield as Rome. A St Andrews graduate, he was exposed to Reformed theology while at Rome and returned to ally himself with the cause. Douglas and Winram were both what might be called academics who held to an Erasmian Catholicism in St Andrews while more and more imbibing clearly Protestant attitudes. Winram's affinity for such views

---

[44] Duncan Shaw, 'John Willock' in Duncan Shaw, ed. *Reformation and Revolution* (Edinburgh: St Andrew Press, 1967), pp. 47, 67.

[45] Ian Hazlett expresses certainty that the three named came to their committee work in 1560 with a familiarity with the Forty-Two Articles of Religion prepared by Thomas Cranmer in 1552 and ratified only weeks before the death of King Edward VI in 1553. See Ian Hazlett, 'The Scots Confession 1560: Context, Complexion, and Critique', *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte* 78 (1987), 303.

had been observed even as he preached in connection with the heresy trial of George Wishart, in 1546.[46]

III. ASSESSMENTS OF SCOTLAND 1560 THAT REFLECT THIS COMPLEXITY

With this diversity noted, we are in a position to do *two* things. We may *first* draw attention to features of the documents put forward in 1560–1562 that require this background for a proper understanding.

In the *Scots Confession*, for example, it has been pointed out that the intimation, given in the preface, that the Confession will be subject to correction if anyone can show a statement repugnant to Scripture, finds an antecedent in a Zurich document from 1523.[47] The doctrine of election, set out in chapter VIII, is a much more modest formulation of this doctrine than what we associate with Calvin, Beza or (for that matter) John Knox.[48] The opening sentences of Chapter XXI (The Sacraments) have been shown to have first appeared in a doctrinal summary composed by á Lasco (Winram's past associate) at Emden.[49] The right of Christian citizens to resist tyrannous rulers is handled much more circumspectly in chapter XXIV (the Magistrate) than in the controversial published writings of John Knox or Christopher Goodman. One writer has traced the moderating influence to John Winram.[50]

In the *First Book of Discipline*, the office of elder — so important for the eventual establishing of an explicitly Presbyterian polity — had already existed in the unofficial Scottish 'privy kirks' meeting in the 1550s under the protection of lesser nobles. The enshrined right of congregations to nominate their own minister (provided that they did so within 40 days, and subject to examination) was a practice which had been enshrined in the polity of the Reformed congregations at Emden to which foreign refugees — formerly welcomed in England — fled with their leader, John à Lasco, after the persecuting Mary Tudor ascended to the English throne

---

46 James Kirk, 'John Winram' in the Nigel M. de S. Cameron ed. *Scottish Dictionary of Church History and Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), p. 876.

47 Shaw, 'John Willock', p. 60.

48 Ian Hazlett, 'The Scots Confession 1560: Context, Complexion, and Critique', *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte* 78 (1987), 311–12 and Shaw, 'Willock', pp. 59, 60.

49 Shaw, 'John Willock', p. 60.

50 Ian Hazlett, 'The Scots Confession 1560: Context, Complexion, and Critique', *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte* 78 (1987), 315.

in 1553.[51] One of the six Johns — John Willock — who fled to Emden with á Lasco in that year and served a congregation of English refugees (part of the larger grouping termed the Marian exiles) worked there under á Lasco's oversight. Both at London and at Emden, á Lasco had filled the pastoral role of 'superintendent', provision for which became an important element of the *First Book of Discipline*.[52]

Second, we may now draw different inferences about the question of indebtedness. We began by noting that from the era of Hume Brown onward, analysts of early Reformation Scotland have found evidence only of the dominance of Calvin, or, of Calvin exerting influence through Knox and the English refugee congregation at Geneva. However, in the light of the diverse influences we have enumerated, there is little wonder that there has long been a choir of voices dissenting from the view set in motion by Hume Brown. In that same decade of the 1890s, A.F. Mitchell (1822–1899) could write in 1899 that these writings are found 'coinciding not infrequently in expression and agreeing generally […] with other Reformed or Calvinistic Confessions […] yet with characteristics of their own'.[53] A decade later, C.G. McCrie (1836–1910), writing in 1906 would go no further than to speak of the Scots Confession's 'general agreement with other Reformed symbols' which evidenced 'now and again […] indications of indebtedness to others'.[54] A.R. MacEwen (1851–1916), writing a decade farther on, insisted that at very least the Confession of Faith was 'an original production with no parallel in the religious literature of any other land. A free use was made of the writings of the continental Reformers […] but this was in matters of detail rather than principle'.[55] Much closer to our own time, Ian Hazlett has insisted (at least as regards the Scots Confession) that besides Calvin, 'other eddies, streams, and contraflows can be discerned'.[56] David F. Wright left it as his opinion of these writings of the formative period of Scotland's Reformation that:

---

51 Basil Hall, *Humanists and Reformers*, 171–207. It is perhaps significant that the year of Willock's departure for Scotland (1555) was also the year of á Lasco's final departure from Emden to Frankfurt on Main.

52 James K. Cameron, ed. *The First Book of Discipline* (Edinburgh: St Andrew Press, 1972), pp. 49–54 and 115–28.

53 A.F. Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation* (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1900), p. 103.

54 C.G. McCrie, *The Confessions of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh: MacNiven and Wallace, 1907), p. 17.

55 A.R. MacEwen, *A History of the Church in Scotland* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1918), II, 161.

56 Ian Hazlett, 'The Scots Confession 1560: Context, Complexion, and Critique', *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte* 78 (1987), 319. Similarly, Michael Lynch,

> In a movement on which no single master stamped his dominant genius, the determinative theological standards were team efforts […] [57]

CONCLUSION

While it is almost certainly the case that the Reformed Church in Scotland moved more clearly into the theological orbit of Geneva in the decades following 1560, the mere return of John Knox from that city to Scotland in 1559 did not ensure or necessitate any such outcome. Of the six men named 'John', Knox alone claimed a personal connection to Geneva and a personal knowledge of Calvin.[58] Especially the elasticity of the Confession of Faith requires us to accept that its framers followed a collaborative and consolidative approach in view of the fact that the primitive Scottish Reformed ministry would enfold a range of individuals indebted to the Edwardian Church of England, Lutheranism in Scandinavia and Saxony, Reformed churches in Emden, Zurich, and Geneva and also Erasmian Catholicism.

To make this observation is not to plead the case for an ongoing theological indeterminacy as being somehow more congruent with the original intention of the Reformers. However, it is to draw attention to an admirable eclecticism, breadth and readiness for collaboration which, if it has not always characterized the Reformed tradition, is most worthy of emulation in our current changed circumstances when theological reconstruction is called for.

'Calvinism and Scotland' in Menna Prestwich, ed. *International Calvinism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 230 has stressed that the Scots Confession represented a 'collation' of non-Calvinist conviction with that of Knox.

57 David F. Wright, 'The Scottish Reformation: Theology and Theologians' in David Bagchi and David Steinmetz, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 175.

58 A point made forcibly by Michael Lynch in his essay, 'Calvinism and Scotland' in Menna Prestwich, ed. *International Calvinism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 229.

Making Clear the Doctrine of the Clarity of Scripture

Philip D. Foster

School of Divinity, New College, University of Edinburgh

In this paper I aim to make clear what the doctrine of the clarity of Scripture is and why it is important for the church today. The doctrine of the clarity of Scripture is an important one for Protestants. It is through this doctrine that the lay person may be encouraged to read and interpret Scripture directly. The interpretation of Scripture is not limited to the province of church leadership or scholars alone, but to all who have the Holy Spirit. It is because of this doctrine that all Christians can be encouraged to read Scripture on their own, in Bible study groups, and in their own language.

However, the doctrine of the clarity of Scripture is ironically obscure. Based on the common definition of clear being 'easy to understand', one may ask: How can Scripture be clear and yet a multiplicity of interpretations abound? How can Scripture be clear and there be a need for further clarification of Scripture? How is this current paper important? Based on the existence of and need for these things, it appears that Scripture is not clear. At the heart of these questions is the idea that clarity of Scripture means that the correct interpretation is *easily* apparent to the hearer or reader. However, this is not what the doctrine means.

To display what the clarity of Scripture means and so address these questions, I will examine portions of the history of the debate and parts of Scripture itself. This will lead to examining how differing interpretations of Scripture occur and demonstrate how the doctrine encourages lay Christians to read and interpret Scripture. I will end with a proposal for how the clarity of Scripture may be taught.

A WORKING DEFINITION OF CLARITY

In order to begin thinking about the doctrine it is useful to have a working definition in mind. *The Westminster Confession of Faith* (WCF) of 1646 provides a good starting point for an elaboration of the doctrine.

> VII. All things in scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place

> of scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.[1]

The WCF asserts that what is necessary for salvation is clear enough (in at least one place) that any person may understand given the ordinary means. The *ordinary means* is a term that will require further elaboration. For now, it will suffice to say that it may include such things as translation of Scripture, preaching, and studying Scripture.

HISTORY OF THE DEBATE

Although the doctrine of the clarity of Scripture came to prominence with the reformation, 'it was not… an innovation of the Reformation'.[2] The church fathers were talking about the clarity of Scripture long before. Irenaeus, in writing against the Gnostic heresies, taught Scripture could be unambiguously understood by all.[3] Augustine also talked about the clarity of Scripture, saying that all matters concerning faith and manner of life are plain in Scripture.[4]

As time passed, Scripture began to be seen as more obscure. Jean Gerson during the years 1414-18 argued that the authority to judge the literal sense of Scripture was held by the church alone.[5] This belief in the role of the Roman Catholic Church as sole interpreter of Scripture was clearly formulated, following the debates of Erasmus and Luther, in the Council of Trent's 1546 *Decree Concerning the Edition, and the Use, of the Sacred Books*. In it the Roman Catholic Church declared against the Protestants that the 'mother Church' had the sole right to 'judge the true

---

1 *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, 1.7.

2 Timothy Ward, *Words of Life: Scripture as the Living and Active Word of God* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009), p. 117.

3 Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, in *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenæus*, ed. by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe, The Ante-Nicene Fathers (Buffalo, NY: The Christian Literature Company, 1885), i, 315–567 (p. 398) (= Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 2.27.2).

4 Aurelius Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, in *St. Augustin's City of God and Christian Doctrine*, ed. by Philip Schaff, trans. by J. F. Shaw, A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 1 (Buffalo, NY: The Christian Literature Company, 1887), ii, 522–97 (p. 539) (= *On Christian Doctrine*, 2.9.14).

5 Mark S. Burrows, *Jean Gerson and De Consolatione Theologiae (1418): The Consolation of a Biblical and Reforming Theology for a Disordered Age* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Pub, 2010), pp. 229–40.

sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures'.[6] Due to the prominence of the reformation debates between (particularly) Erasmus and Luther it is helpful to examine them in order to better understand the doctrine.

Erasmus and Luther

In 1524 Erasmus wrote his work *The Freedom of the Will (De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collation)* to combat the ideas of Luther and his followers. Luther replied a year later in his work *The Bondage of the Will (De servo arbitrio).* These works epitomise the debate over the clarity of Scripture.

In *The Freedom of the Will* Erasmus argued for the obscurity of at least some parts of Scripture.[7] If Scripture is clear, why do we need people to interpret it? Erasmus argued that because of Scripture's obscurity, the Holy Spirit was given to the ordained for the interpretation of Scripture.[8] Furthermore, when working from the premise that all could interpret, he asks how a matter (in this case free choice) can be resolved when there are people of all sorts holding to both sides of the debate. He suggests that when we take away the ruling of the church in these matters there is no way to be sure about a matter; everything becomes subjective argument.[9]

To some degree this comment about subjectivity is true. However, arguments must be made from Scripture as a unified canon, and this limits what can be argued. In the WCF we can see that the doctrine does not mean that everything is clear in itself, or equally clear to all. Luther states: 'I admit, of course, that there are many texts in the Scriptures that are obscure and abstruse.'[10] However, Luther goes on to qualify that this is not because of Scripture itself. In fact, later on Luther states 'I will not have any part of it called obscure.'[11]

---

6 The Council of Trent, 'The Canons and Dogmatic Decrees of the Council of Trent. A.D. 1563', in *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes: The Greek and Latin Creeds, with Translations*, ed. by Philip Schaff, trans. by J. Waterworth, 3 vols (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1890), ii, 77–206 (p. 83).

7 Desiderius Erasmus, *On the Freedom of the Will, in Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation*, trans. by E. Gordon Rupp (The Library of Christian Classics; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), pp. 35–97 (pp. 38–39).

8 Erasmus, *Freedom of the Will*, p. 44.

9 Ibid., pp. 44–45.

10 Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will, in Career of the Reformer III*, ed. & trans. by Philip S. Watson, *Luther's Works* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1999), xxxiii, 3–295 (p. 25).

11 Ibid., p. 94.

According to Luther, one reason for interpretative struggles is our difficulty with vocabulary and grammar.[12] In addition, Luther argues that much remains obscure for many people due to their blindness, or not taking the trouble to look.[13] With reference to Erasmus' argument that some things are impossible to understand,[14] Luther argues that this is not a matter for the clarity of Scripture. Although some matters such as the Trinity and humanity of Christ are not explained clearly in Scripture, the fact is that these things are true is clear in Scripture. Luther writes 'But *how* these things can be, Scripture does not say (as you imagine), nor is it necessary to know.'[15] Luther argues that Erasmus has confused theological matters affirmed in Scripture with the explanation of how these matters can exist. So according to Luther language, spiritual blindness, and lack of effort are barriers to interpretation.

Luther explains the clarity of Scripture in terms of two forms: internal and external. Internal clarity is that given by the Holy Spirit. A person cannot truly understand Scripture without the Holy Spirit (Ps. 14:1).[16] Contrary to Erasmus, Luther says that because all Christians have the Holy Spirit they can through the Spirit interpret the Scriptures so as to judge 'the dogmas and opinions of all men'.[17]

Externally, Luther says the entirety of Scripture is clear: 'everything there is in the Scriptures has been brought out by the Word into the most definite light, and published to all the world'.[18] But what does Luther mean by external clarity? External clarity is that belonging to public ministry and the primary concern of leaders and preachers. It entails judging dogmas for the whole church according to Scripture itself.[19] However, contrary to the Roman Catholic Church, the authority of such judgement comes from Scripture alone, tradition and church hierarchy. Therefore, Luther is saying that Scripture is clear to all through the proclamation of Scripture, as those proclaiming Scripture listen to the Holy Spirit within who gives internal clarity. In arguing for the two sources of clarity Luther holds in tension both private judgement and the judgement of the church. The place for resolving issues is 'in the presence of the Church [and] at the bar of Scripture'.[20]

---

12 Ibid., p. 25.
13 Ibid., p. 27.
14 Erasmus, *Freedom of the Will*, pp. 38–39.
15 Luther, *Bondage of the Will*, p. 28.
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid., p. 90.
18 Ibid., p. 28.
19 Ibid., p. 91.
20 Ibid.

Whitaker and Turretin

From this examination of the clarity of Scripture in Luther's thought it may appear that there is no space for differing abilities to understand Scripture. However, the WCF says 'All things in scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all.'[21] Luther argues that Scripture is clear in its entirety, but that mediating factors (such as obscure grammar) can render parts unclear to us. In contrast, it appears that the WCF, limits absolute clarity to matters of salvation. This also seems to be the case in Whitaker (1548-95) and Turretin (1623-87).[22] However, Whitaker affirms Luther's belief that Scripture is clear in its entirety, but that parts of Scripture are unclear due to secondary reasons (such as grammar).[23] Turretin argues that there are degrees of clarity in Scripture,[24] but that what is necessary for salvation is clear enough that it can be understood without the help of external tradition.[25] There seem to be two issues going on here: the clarity of Scripture, mediated by the Spirit, making it understandable; and the ability of a person to understand Scripture. The presence of these two factors can explain how Whitaker can both affirm Luther and then say

> Meanwhile, we concede that there are many obscure places, and that the scriptures need explication; and that, on this account, God's ministers are to be listened to when they expound the word of God, and the men best skilled in scripture are to be consulted.[26]

Luther argues that Scripture is clear through the Spirit. The only obscurity is caused by the reader through: not taking the trouble to look; grammatical difficulties; or attempting to understand *how* something such as the Trinity can be when Scripture is silent on the issue. It appears that Whitaker, Turretin, and the WCF are dealing with the interaction between the ability of individuals to understand Scripture and the clarity of Scripture mediated through the Spirit when they assert that the essentials of salvation and faith are so clear they may be understood by the

---

21 *Westminster Confession*, 1.7.

22 Francis Turretin, *The Doctrine of Scripture: Locus 2 of Institutio Theologiae Elencticae*, trans. by John W. Beardslee III (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1981), p. 186; William Whitaker, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture, against the Papists, Especially Bellarmine and Stapleton*, trans. by William Fitzgerald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849), p. 364 <https://archive.org/details/disputationonhol00whituoft> [accessed 5 May 2015].

23 Whitaker, *Disputation*, pp. 359–64.

24 Turretin, *Institutio*, p. 187.

25 Ibid., p. 188.

26 Whitaker, *Disputation*, p. 364.

learned and unlearned alike. Conversely, when they say that Scripture is not equally clear to all they are solely addressing the ability of individuals to understand Scripture.[27] This attention to the individual abilities of different people is an important part of the doctrine. In addition to this attention to ability Turretin also points to the need for effort. This could perhaps be seen to elaborate on Luther's 'taking the trouble to look'.

> Although the Scriptures are to be searched (John 5:39), it does not follow that they are obscure everywhere […] (1) We do not say that it is understandable to everyone, but only to the mind of one who is ready to learn and earnest in study [...] All things become obscure very easily to those who read halfheartedly and carelessly. (2) We do not deny that there are in Scripture its secrets, which can be found out only by great effort and through investigation, but this does not prevent there being many other matters, and especially those necessary for salvation, which are easily seen by the eyes of the faithful.[28]

The work of these scholars is helpful, but the examination of Scripture is more important. Luther and many others since have found reason to believe in Scripture's clarity through the testimony of Scripture, which attests it is the bar against which doctrine must be judged.

SCRIPTURE IS CLEAR

Scripture makes it abundantly clear that it is useful and can be understood. This is seen in both Testaments. I will first highlight some passages on clarity in the OT, then in the NT, and then move on to passages that qualify what clarity means.

The Old Testament is Clear

One of the most famous parts of the OT is the Shema (Deut. 6:4-9). In this passage it speaks of the commandments of the Torah as though they can be learnt and understood. They are simple enough that they can be learnt by children (Deut. 6:7). Furthermore, Deuteronomy 30:11-14 explicitly states that the Law passed on to Israel was not too difficult and could be understood. Similarly, in Psalm 19:7 David makes the claim that 'The testimony of the Lord is trustworthy, making the simple wise.' The word simple (פֶּתִי *peti*) refers to a person who is easy to lead astray, and

[27] Turretin, *Institutio*, pp. 186–87; Whitaker, *Disputation*, p. 364; Westminster Confession, 1.7.

[28] Turretin, *Institutio*, p. 192.

are prone to mistakes, believing whatever they are told.[29] So we see that David's claim here is that God's laws are such that they can even make wise those who are easy to lead astray.

In Psalm 119, God's words are said to give light both to the simple (Ps. 119:130), and to one's path (Ps. 119:105). This metaphor of light is used to convey the idea of giving understanding.[30] Furthermore, the prophets constantly speak to all the people, expecting all to listen and understand the message from God.[31] Therefore, we can see that the concept of the clarity of Scripture is found in the OT. In a similar way, we can see the NT affirming the clarity of Scripture.

The New Testament is Clear

Just as the prophets prophesied to all people expecting that all could understand, Jesus spoke to the Jews and the NT leaders wrote to whole churches with the assumption that all the people could understand.[32] The public reading of Scripture is also said to be beneficial (1 Tim. 4:13), and all Scripture is said to be useful for equipping every believer to serve God (2 Tim. 3:16-17). In addition, the Berean Jews were called more εὐγενεστεροι (*eugenesteroi*, noble-minded) than the Thessalonian Jews, because they examined Scripture to determine if what Paul said to them was true (Acts 17:11). It is assumed here that individuals can judge the truth of Paul's words based on Scripture alone. Another parallel to the OT understanding of clarity is seen in an exhortation to children (Eph. 6:1-3). Scripture is not too obscure for children. Furthermore, the clarity of Scripture extends to matters other than salvation. 'All Scripture is God-breathed useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting, and training in righteousness' (2 Tim. 3:16-17, NIV 2011). Despite these affirmations of

---

29 Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: Coded with Strong's Concordance Numbers, ed. by E. Brown (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996), sec. פֶּתִי; Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 2004), p. 106.

30 Wayne Grudem, 'The Perspicuity of Scripture', *Themelios*, 34.3 (2009), 288–308 (p. 292).

31 The prophesied inability to understand in Isa. 6:9, Matt. 13:14-15, and Rom. 11:8 can be explained in terms of Luther's category of blindness and not taking the effort to understand. Isa. 1:10f; 5:3f; 9:1; 40:1f; Jer. 2:4; 4:1; 10:1; Ezek. 3:1. See Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics: Prolegomena*, trans. by John Vriend, 4 vols (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003), I, 477.

32 Matt. 9:13; 12:3, 5; 19:4; 21:42; 22:29, 31; Luke 24:25; John 3:10; 1 Cor. 1:2; Gal. 1:2; Phil. 1:1. Letters were also expected to be understood and useful for teaching in other churches (Col. 4:16).

clarity there are a number of qualifications within Scripture itself that must be addressed. These may be thought of in terms of the second issue: the ability of each person to understand Scripture.

Qualifications

Scripture is clear, but cannot be understood instantly. Scripture emphasises that a process is involved in understanding Scripture. The commands to meditate on God's law point to a process leading to greater understanding (Josh. 1:8; Ps. 1:2). Furthermore, in Acts 15 there is an example of the early church requiring time and debate to come to an understanding of what God wanted. A process towards full understanding is made explicit in 2 Corinthians 1:13-14.

From the call to meditate on Scripture we can say that Scripture takes effort to understand. A good example of this can be found in Ezra the scribe who carefully studied the law (Ezra 7:10). Another is found in 2 Peter 3:15-16 where Peter affirms that some concepts conveyed in Scripture are hard to understand (but does not say it is impossible).[33]

Given the need to keep working on understanding Scripture more, it is apparent that we will not come to a full understanding in this life.[34] This does not mean that parts of Scripture are unable to be understood, rather that we are limited in the amount we can come to understand in our lifetimes. Turretin explains it in terms of 1 Corinthians 13:12 'Now I know in part; then I shall know fully' (NIV) saying that we have imperfect knowledge in this life and will not fully know until the next.[35]

In addition to there being a process of understanding, Scripture is said to be understood through 'due use of the ordinary means'.[36] The 'ordinary means' contains a number of factors:

1. Scripture must be in a language that people can understand (cf. 1 Cor. 14:10-11, 16). This is what Luther meant when he said that one reason for obscurity was 'ignorance of their vocabulary and grammar.'[37]

---

33 Grudem, 'The Perspicuity of Scripture', p. 295; Larry Dean Pettegrew, 'The Perspicuity of Scripture', *Master's Seminary Journal*, 15.2 (2004), 209–25 (p. 213).

34 Grudem applies Ps. 139:6 and Isa. 55:8-9 here. However, these do not adequately address the issue because they talk directly about God and not his word given to us. Grudem, 'The Perspicuity of Scripture', pp. 300–01.

35 Turretin, *Institutio*, pp. 191–92.

36 *Westminster Confession*, 1.7.

37 Luther, *Bondage of the Will*, p. 25.

2. Scripture is understood through people who teach or explain it. God has given teachers to the church as a gift (1 Cor. 12:28).[38] Scripture at times affirms the need for such a guide (Luke 24:27; Acts 8:30-31).

3. Scripture is understood in fellowship with other Christians and may involve debate. This may be seen in the councils of the early church (e.g. Acts 15).

A natural extension to points 2 and 3 above is that teachers and councils may not necessarily be those that happen in our current time. The writings and traditions of teachers and councils of the past can also be considered as part of an ongoing debate about the interpretation of Scripture. The list of ordinary means may not be limited to these.[39]

Scripture is understood only when the reader is willing to obey it. Being unwilling to obey Scripture can lead to a failure to understand it (John 8:43). In exegesis of John 5:37-47, Brian Wagner argues this passage affirms a conditional clarity for the unbeliever. Scripture is clear if they are willing to search it and are open to what it teaches.[40] Similarly, when someone is knowingly practising sin they are less able to understand (1 Cor. 3:1-3).

Scripture is understood with the help of the Holy Spirit. In Psalm 119 the psalmist frequently petitions God for the ability to understand.[41] Similarly, the NT reveals the need of God's help to understand, and this ability is affirmed for the layperson.[42] These passages do not specifically say that we need the Holy Spirit to understand. However, the Holy Spirit is presented as our teacher in the NT (John 14:26; 1 Cor. 2:12) and this is why we say today that the help of the Holy Spirit is needed.[43] Given this point treats the original audiences of the OT and NT in the same way, it may conflict with doctrines of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit acted differently prior to Jesus. In Ezekiel 36:27 and Joel 2:28-32 it says that in the future the Spirit will be given to every believer. Jesus promised to send the

---

38 This includes reading commentaries (a written form of teaching) and the church's history of interpretation (historical teaching). Grudem, 'The Perspicuity of Scripture', pp. 296–97.

39 Grudem, 'The Perspicuity of Scripture', pp. 296–98.

40 Brian H. Wagner, '"The Father's Clear Testimony" (John 5:37-47): Christ's Teaching of the Conditional Perspicuity of Scripture', *Journal of Dispensational Theology*, 15.45 (2011), 27–46 (pp. 40–41).

41 Ps. 119:18, 27, 34, 73.

42 Luke 24:44-45; 1 Cor. 2:14-15; 2 Cor. 3:14-16; 4:3-4; 1 John 2:20; 1 Pet. 2:9. Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, I, 478.

43 Grudem, 'The Perspicuity of Scripture', p. 299.

Spirit (John 15:26-27) and that is what occurred at Pentecost (Acts 1:5; 2:1-4).[44] The role of the Spirit in aiding understanding of Scripture is not mentioned in the OT.[45] However, although the fullness of the Spirit was not dwelling in all believers,[46] the Spirit still had a role in helping those who sought help to understand (Ps. 119).

In summary Scripture is clear, but humans have limited and varying capacities to understand Scripture. Scripture is to be understood through use of the ordinary means. The reader must be willing to obey it, and must have the help of the Holy Spirit.[47] With respect to the issue of many interpretations, the following (and last) qualification on the clarity of Scripture is important. So we will move on to examining how Scripture can be misinterpreted.

HOW CAN SCRIPTURE BE MISINTERPRETED?

Scripture is clear, but humans can still misinterpret Scripture. Luther suggests that people misinterpret Scripture solely because of the work of Satan.[48] However, given he previously mentioned grammar and other matters, this statement seems to be saying that beyond a failure of the ordinary means, Scripture is solely misinterpreted due to Satan's influence. Luther supports this with passages that talk about the blinding of unbelievers.[49]

Berkouwer suggests this view is inadequate, but fails to describe factors beyond those of the ordinary means.[50] The blinding only describes how those without the Holy Spirit can misinterpret Scripture. We must be able to also talk about those who have the Spirit. One reason is that

---

44 Cf. John 20:22.

45 As a result, systematic theologies do not tend to mention this when discussing the work of the Spirit in OT times. This may be an oversight that needs correcting. Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 3rd edn (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2013), pp. 789–93; Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, pp. 636–37.

46 Erickson, *Christian Theology*, pp. 792–93.

47 Scripture can obviously be understood to some degree by anyone. However, it is the Holy Spirit that ensures clarity. Turretin suggests a difference between the literal and theoretical meaning and the spiritual and practical meaning. The spiritual and practical he suggests is restricted to those who have faith. Turretin, *Institutio*, p. 193.

48 Luther, *Bondage of the Will*, pp. 99–100.

49 2 Cor. 3:15; 4:3f. Luther, *Bondage of the Will*, p. 27.

50 G. C. Berkouwer, *Holy Scripture*, trans. by Jack Bartlett Rogers (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1975), pp. 268–69.

we must be willing to *obey* Scripture. People can intentionally distort the meaning of difficult passages of Scripture (2 Pet. 3:3-6, 16).

In addition, due to an inability to *fully* understand Scripture in this life, each interpreter may stress different parts of the Bible to different degrees. Because of limits to our knowledge, this could lead to an over-emphasis on one or more facets, skewing the whole theological system. This in turn can lead to misinterpreting Scripture, a misinterpretation that could be said to derive from the limitation of the human intellect rather than a wilful attempt to deceive or the blinding of Satan. However, it is also possible that people may come up with different interpretations that are both correct and compatible, just as there are four gospels that all teach truth and are compatible (cf. Heb. 4:12).[51]

So we see that a system that rightly allows individual interpretation can lead to many interpretations. As Berkhof has said, the Roman Catholic Church was right in one respect: belief in the clarity of Scripture leads to a less unified interpretation of Scripture.[52]

In summary, the main reasons why people with the Spirit can arrive at multiple interpretations are: misinterpretation due to unwillingness to obey Scripture; being unable to fully understand Scripture; and bringing different facets of Scripture to the fore, thus having a different emphasis of interpretation.

CONFUSION OVER CLARITY

There has been some confusion over the doctrine of clarity. We saw that Luther emphasised the absolute clarity of Scripture. The WCF (and others) emphasised the absolute clarity of what is necessary for salvation, but also made mention of human limitations. Two modern definitions by Thompson and Grudem (respectively) also appear to emphasise different things:

---

[51] Some dispute the compatibility of the gospels, but others have shown the weakness of their arguments. For example see Paul Barnett, *Gospel Truth: Answering New Atheist Attacks on the Gospels* (Nottingham: IVP, 2012), pp. 83–108.

[52] However, it could be argued that the Roman Catholic Church only provides a front of unified interpretation (in the form of 'official doctrine') as there is much variation between their theologians. Louis Berkhof, *Introductory Volume to Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1932), p. 167.

> The clarity of Scripture is that quality of the biblical text that, as God's communicative act, ensures meaning is accessible to all who come to it in faith.[53]

> The clarity of Scripture means that the Bible is written in such a way that its teachings are able to be understood by all who will read it seeking God's help and being willing to follow it.[54]

Timothy Ward notes that Thompson's definition is helpful in that it keeps the focus on God's 'dynamic presence' acting through Scripture.[55] Grudem's definition (the latter) is helpful as it comes out of a thorough examination of biblical theology. However, as Ward points out, they both differ from the classic definitions exemplified by the WCF.[56] Ward argues the problem is that both Thompson and Grudem's definition focus too much on the individual and private reading. He argues rather that the doctrine means that we can 'base our saving knowledge of him [God] and of ourselves, and our beliefs and our actions, on the content of Scripture alone'.[57] However, Ward's definition neglects mention of the need for use of the ordinary means. Thus all three modern definitions are less satisfactory than that of the WCF. The first two deal with only a part of the doctrine (that Scripture is clear), but leave the issue of the limitations of human intellect unmentioned. Ward's definition takes into account limitation by speaking of what is made clear through Scripture to all Christians, but neglects mention of the ordinary means. Ward also appears to inadequately address the reformation claim that Scripture is clear in its entirety. In response to this confusion I propose we talk of a dual doctrine in order to better teach the clarity of Scripture.

Proposal: A Dual Doctrine of the Clarity of Scripture and the Limitations of Human Intellect and Spiritual Blinding

A dual doctrine of the clarity of Scripture and the limitation of human intellect openly and clearly acknowledges both facets to the traditional doctrine of clarity. The first part of the doctrine (that of the clarity of Scripture) would affirm wholeheartedly that Scripture is clear in all its parts. The reason that Scripture is guaranteed to be understandable is

---

53 Mark D. Thompson, *A Clear and Present Word: The Clarity of Scripture*, New Studies in Biblical Theology, 21 (Nottingham: Apollos, 2006), pp. 169–70.

54 Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, p. 108.

55 Ward, *Words of Life*, p. 127.

56 Ibid., p. 125; *Westminster Confession*, 1.7.

57 Ibid., p. 129.

that as God's communicative act, he makes it understandable through the action of the Holy Spirit.[58]

This is not without qualification. The qualification comes in the form of the second part of the dual doctrine: The limitations of human intellect and spiritual blinding. This second part would affirm all the qualifications stated above.

Despite the limitations of the human intellect, the doctrine would affirm that God in his grace guarantees that with the help of the Holy Spirit, and through one form of the message or another (ordinary means) all can understand what is necessary for salvation. Furthermore, because all Scripture is clear (with the Holy Spirit and through use of the ordinary means) all Christians can be encouraged to delve into all Scripture in order to learn more than they currently know in accordance with their abilities and in community with the church.

Conversely, although all Scripture is clear, misinterpretations can exist due to our natural limitations. As a result, all must approach the interpretation of Scripture in prayerful humility, acknowledging that at any point we may be wrong and another may be right. This goes for all Christians, those at the highest levels of the Christian academy as well as the lay person with no formal education. We also need to take care in attending to the ordinary means. The ordinary means includes but is not limited to: either understanding the original language or using a suitable translation; listening to the voices of teachers past and present; and interpreting within the Christian community. We must remember that human effort is required and interpretation may be hard work at times. The need for attention to past teachers means that tradition, church councils, and creeds, while not holding supreme authority of interpretation in themselves must be given due consideration in our own attempts to understand Scripture. A failure to attend to tradition may easily result in misinterpretations due to the world-view from which we approach Scripture.

Thus the dual doctrine of the clarity of Scripture and the limitation of human intellect affirms that the entirety of Scripture can be understood, but also that fallen humans are unable to grasp all of Scripture.[59] An appeal to such limitation is not a satisfactory excuse for a lack of effort

[58] Thompson, *Clear and Present*, pp. 169–70.

[59] What the incarnate Christ was able to understand has been debated (cf. Luke 2:52; John 16:12-15). However, there is not space here to engage in that debate. What is more important for the current question concerns primarily the knowledge of the risen Christ which is made known to believers through the Spirit (John 16:12-15). This transmission of knowledge about Scripture ensures that all Scripture can be understood. See also the *Westminster Confession*, 8.8.

to understand because, as Whitaker says, a fundamental principle of the doctrine is that 'the scriptures are sufficiently clear' that they may be read 'by the people and the unlearned with some fruit and utility'.[60]

Now we may see that the questions posed at the start have been answered. How can Scripture be clear and yet a multiplicity of interpretations abound? How can Scripture be clear and there be a need for further clarification of Scripture? How is this current paper important? All of these are answered in through the second facet of the doctrine — the limitation of the human intellect. It is because of the limitation of the human intellect that such a use of the ordinary means is required. Conversely, it is because of the first facet of the doctrine that all Christians should be encouraged to examine the Scriptures.

[60] I reworded the centre of the translation 'to admit of their being read' into modern English. Whitaker, *Disputation*, p. 364.

THE LORD'S SUPPER AT THE CENTRE OF REFORMED FAITH AND CONDUCT WHY DID ZURICH DIFFER FROM WITTENBERG?

Joe Mock

Sydney, NSW, Australia

I. INTRODUCTION

The unmistakable unifying factor of the reformers was their unchanging commitment to the doctrine of justification by faith alone, in Christ alone by grace alone. Despite some varying nuances in the way they may have expressed the relationship between justification and sanctification, their confessions attest to their unity with respect to what they regarded as the not negotiable, central and fundamental basis of evangelical faith. They stood shoulder to shoulder against Rome's doctrine of the salvation by faith and works. A further shared tenet of the reformers was their total rejection of the teaching and practice of Rome concerning the doctrine of transubstantiation and the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass.

The sharp disagreement between Luther (1483–1546) and Zwingli (1484–1531) at the Colloquy of Marburg (1529) with respect to the presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist has been well documented. In reality, there was agreement between these two reformers on fourteen of the fifteen articles. Indeed, as Peter Stephens has observed: 'in the fifteenth article on the Lord's Supper there was agreement on five points, and the question on which they disagreed (the presence of Christ) was put into a subordinate clause.'[1] Philipp I of Hessen had his hopes dashed of achieving a symbol of Protestant unity that he planned to be forged at Marburg. In the event, the dynamics of the ongoing strained relationship between Wittenberg and Zurich meant that any attempt towards a pan-Protestant movement would prove to be unsuccessful. The depth to which the relationship between Wittenberg and Zurich had deteriorated was reflected in Luther's ire which he openly expressed in his *Brief Confession Concerning the Holy Sacrament* (*Kurzes Bekenntnis von heiligen Sakrament*, 1544) and the sharp response of Bullinger (1504–1575) on behalf of the ministers of Zurich in the *True Confession* (*Wahrhaftes Bekenntnuss*, 1545). In the wake of Marburg, Zurich's refusal to endorse either the *Augsburg Confession* (1530) or the *Altered Augsburg Confession*,

[1] W. Peter Stephens, 'Zwingli and Luther', *Evangelical Quarterly*, 71 (no.1, 1999), p. 51.

(1540) that Calvin was willing to sign, or, for that matter, the *Wittenberg Confession* (1536) were major hurdles to closer ties between Wittenberg and Zurich during challenging times for the Reformation in Europe. This was despite the sustained efforts of Bucer, in particular, over many years.

This paper seeks to examine the factors as to why there was such a fundamental disagreement between Bullinger and Luther and, therefore, between Zurich and Wittenberg, with respect to their understanding and practice of the eucharist. Despite the fact that both of these reformers were committed to *sola Scriptura* and *claritas Scripturae*, nonetheless, they remained divided on this fundamental aspect of evangelical faith and practice. After Luther had departed from the scene the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549) which had been hammered out between Calvin and Bullinger was the object of vehement attack by the Lutheran scholars. The goal of this paper is to identify the major factors that led to Bullinger differing from Luther *so uncompromisingly* with respect to the eucharist.

II. OVERVIEW OF BULLINGER'S PERCEPTION OF AND RELATIONSHIP WITH LUTHER

There is no doubt that, with respect to Luther, Bullinger did not 'play the man' despite their theological differences. He held Luther in high regard because of his fearless efforts for the cause of the Reformation. In his *History of the Reformation* which was written in the 1570s Bullinger portrayed Luther positively for his courageous stand against indulgences in the face of great opposition. In the course of events, Bullinger and Luther did not get to meet each other even though they did exchange correspondence.[2] In the 1530s they exchanged rather amicable letters. Yet by the late 1530s Bullinger became decidedly frank in what he wrote about Luther. For example, in his letter of 8 March 1539 to the town clerk of Bern, Bullinger shared the following opinions of Luther:

> I recognize Luther as a man who has erred and is able to err, who ought to be admonished about error and controlled. I do not approve of those who have determined to build a bookcase out of our new understanding.[3]

By the mid 1540s Bullinger and Luther were writing rather less than amicable letters. Significantly, in Bullinger's letter to Joachim Vadian in May

---

[2] A helpful study of the correspondence between Bullinger and Luther may be found in James D. Mohr, 'Heinrich Bullinger's Opinions Concerning Martin Luther' (MA Thesis, Kent State University Graduate School, 1972).

[3] *Corpus Reformatorum: Johannis Calvinis Operae quae Supersunt omnia, vol. X*, p. 322.

1543 Bullinger complained about the way Luther treated the Zurich theologians:

> Luther has never ceased, both publicly and privately, to condemn Zwingli and ourselves. We have written to him privately, just as decreed, but he did not respond, disregarding us and criticizing us sharply.[4]

The frequent correspondence between Bullinger and Bucer (1491–1551) provides a further window as to how Bullinger viewed Luther. In 1544 Bullinger wrote these words from his heart to Bucer:

> I would rather die than disown the simple and certain truth of our church for a dream of concord. Better concord with the truth and discord with Luther than concord with him and discord with the truth.[5]

For his part, Luther made some rather derogatory comments about Bullinger which are recorded in the *Table Talk*:

> This leads the sacramentalists astray. They speak according to their own ideas, but we speak what God says. Before the world existed, God said, 'Let there be a world,' and the world was. So it says here [in the Lord's Supper], 'Let this be my body,' and it is, nor is it prevented by the scoffing of Bullinger, who says that because the body of Christ isn't seen it isn't present. For in the former instance God created visible things but in the latter instance he created invisible, in such fashion as he wished.[6]

Bullinger did seek to be patient with Luther because of his regard for Luther. However, in time, his patience ran out.

III. TO WHAT EXTENT WAS THE YOUNG BULLINGER INFLUENCED BY LUTHER?

There is no doubt that the young Bullinger was strongly influenced and inspired by Luther's early writings and that, at the beginning, he admired and appreciated Luther's exegetical skills. In an entry in his *Diarium* in 1521 Bullinger records that 'I discovered that Luther comes nearer to the ancient theologians than do the scholastics.'[7] In this connection,

---

4 *Die Vadianische Briefwechsel, vol. VI*, p. 322.

5 Carl Pestalozzi, *Heinrich Bullinger: Leben und ausgewälte Schriften* (Elberfeld: Verlag von R.L. Friderichs, 1858), p. 227.

6 *LW*, 54, p. 89.

7 Emil Egli (ed.), *Heinrich Bullingers Diarium* (Basel: Basler Buch und Antiquariatshandlung, 1904), p. 6.

Susi Hausammann has analyzed how the young Bullinger closely followed Luther's exegetical method in his *Concerning the Matter of Scripture* (*De scripturae negotio*, 1523)[8] and his *Interpretation of the Epistle of Romans* (*Römerbriefauslegung*, 1525).[9] However, it is clear that, over time, Bullinger differed from Luther in the manner he exegeted Scripture. For example, Peter Opitz has studied the exegetical methods used by Bullinger as outlined by him in the preface to his combined volume on the commentaries of the Pauline epistles (1537). He concluded that Bullinger not only focused on the scope of the entire message of the canon, but, at the same time, promoted the use of humanist rhetorical methods as a tool by which to ascertain how to interpret the Pauline corpus as 'living human language and likewise as goal-directed speech.'[10] Indeed, that the tools of humanism so evidently underlie Bullinger's works led Irena Backus to conclude that Bullinger was 'the first person to establish a link between humanism and the Reformation.'[11]

Bullinger's alleged influence by and dependence on Luther bas been strongly suggested by Garcia Archilla who argues that Bullinger relied heavily on Luther's *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520), especially in *The Old Faith* (1537). He states that 'The similarities between Luther's paragraph and Bullinger's account are so extensive, that more could be understood of Bullinger by what he fails to take up, than by what he does indeed accept from Luther.'[12] However, while it may not be surprising to identify the same themes discussed by both Luther and Bullinger this does not necessarily indicate dependence, but, rather, drawing from the same well. In point of fact, a study of Bullinger's use of the Latin words

---

8 Susi Hausammann, 'Anfragen zum Schriftverständnis des jungen Bullinger im Zusammenhang einer Interpretation von "De scripturae negotio"' in *Heinrich Bullinger 1504–1575: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag Erster Band: Leben und Werk* ed. by Ulrich Gäbler and Erland Herkenrath (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1975), pp. 29–48.

9 Susi Hausammann, *Römerbriefauslegung zwischen Humanismus und Reformation* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1970).

10 Peter Opitz, 'Bullinger on Romans' in *Reformation Readings of Romans* ed. by Kathy Ehrensperger and R. Ward Holder (New York: T & T Clark, 2008), pp. 151–52.

11 Irena Backus, 'The Church Fathers and the Humanities in the Renaissance and the Reformation' in *Re-Envisioning Christian Humanism: Education and the Restoration of Humanity* ed. by Jens Zimmerman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 33–54.

12 Aurelia A. Garcia Archilla, *The Theology of History and Apologetic Historiography in Heinrich Bullinger: Truth in History* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992), p. 12, fn. 6.

for 'covenant' (specifically *foedus*, *testamentum* and *pactum*) in his treatise on the covenant (*De testamento*, 1534) and the *Decades* (1549–1551) reveals marked differences between Bullinger's use of these terms and that of Luther.[13] While it is true that Luther did juxtapose the terms *foedus*, *testamentum* and *pactum* on one occasion in the *Babylonian Captivity*, nonetheless he did not, unlike Bullinger, view the terms *foedus* and *testamentum* as interchangeable. Luther regarded the eucharist as Christ's *testamentum* that was ratified by his death, sealed by his flesh and blood and given under the bread and wine. Hence, for Luther, *testamentum* referred primarily to God's 'promise.'[14] This was particularly emphasized in *A treatise on the New Testament, that is the Holy Mass* (1520):

> Now as the testament is much more important than the sacrament, so the words are much more important than the signs. For the signs might well be lacking, if only one has the words; and thus without sacrament, yet not without testament, one might be saved. For I can enjoy the sacrament in the mass every day if only I keep before my eyes the testament, that is, the words and promise of Christ, and feed and strengthen my faith on them.[15]

In reality, by the mid 1520s Bullinger had decidedly moved away from some of Luther's teaching, particularly his understanding of the eucharist. A case can be made that Bullinger had hammered out his understanding of the eucharist during his purple patch at Kappel am Albis and had shared this with Zwingli.[16] Although Bullinger's works may indicate hints to his reading of Luther, it appears that there is only one recorded reference to Luther in his pre-Zurich years.[17]

---

13 Joe Mock, 'Biblical and Theological Themes in Heinrich Bullinger's *»De testamento« (1534)', Zwingliana,* 40 (2013), pp. 28–31.

14 Volker Leppin, 'Martin Luther' in *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation* ed. by Lee Wandel Palmer (Leiden: Brill, 2013), p. 47.

15 *LW*, 35, p. 91. Cf his comment in *Sermo de Testamento Christi* (1520) — 'From this I gather, the general sense of the word "testament" is used when God contracts with men through the promise. In fact, these words signify the thing in the same way: pact, treaty, testament, promise', *WA*, 9, p. 446.

16 Joe Mock, 'To What Extent Did Bullinger Influence Zwingli with Regards to His Understanding of the Covenant of Eucharist?' *Colloquium*, (no.1, 2017), pp. 89–108; 'Bullinger and the Lord's Supper' in *From Zwingli to Amyraut: Exploring the Growth of European Reformed Traditions*, ed. by Jon Balserak and Jim West (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2017), pp. 57–64.

17 *Von warer und falscher leer* (Zürich, 14 May, 1527), p. 89b (Msc Nr. 376 in Stadtbibliothek Vadiana, St Gallen) as cited in Joachim Staedtke, *Die Theologie des jungen Bullinger* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag Zürich, 1962), p. 46.

Bullinger was greatly helped and inspired by Luther's early works as well as Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* but as he compared and contrasted the works of Luther and Melanchthon as well as those of the church fathers with Scripture he soon came to his own grasp and understanding of the message of the Bible as a whole and of the eucharist in particular. Fritz Blanke records that during his time in the cloister at Kappel am Albis it was Bullinger's practice to go to a corner and pray for the duration of the mass after the sermon during the Sunday service. He would then join with the others as they left the church.[18] Because of Bullinger's admiration of Luther as a person as well as his appreciation for Luther's early writings it may well be the case that he declined the invitation to accompany Zwingli to Marburg. Bullinger gave the main reason for not attending Marburg was that he had recently got married and had just commenced ministry as pastor at Bremgarten. However, I would like to propose that the underlying reason may well have been that he now differed so much from his erstwhile 'hero' on the eucharist, which he viewed so fundamental to evangelical faith, that he was reticent to meet him face to face.

IV. BULLINGER AND LUTHER DIFFERED IN THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF *CLARITAS SCRIPTURAE* AND EMPLOYED DIFFERENT HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES

The major difference between Bullinger and Luther was their approach to Scripture. When Bullinger replied with his *True Confession* to Luther's *Brief Confession* he appended Luther's work to his. This was Bullinger's way of indicating that he had carefully read and considered Luther's work and that he was urging Luther to pay attention to Bullinger's conclusions based on his reading of Scripture. When Bullinger was seeking to defend Zwingli and the church at Zurich from the attacks of Luther he referred to 1 Corinthians 14:32 where Paul points out that what is declared by prophets is subject to the control of the other prophets.[19] Indeed, Bullinger subscribed not only to the priesthood of all believers but also to the prophethood of all believers.[20] The touchstone for this was the correct interpretation of Scripture. This was the spirit in which the *True Confession* was written and sent to Luther.

Jaroslav Pelikan pointed out that in his controversy with Eck at Leipzig and in the controversy over the eucharist Luther maintained four

[18] Fritz Blanke, *Der junge Bullinger 1504–1531* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag Zürich, 1942), p. 58.

[19] Daniël Timmerman, *Heinrich Bullinger on Prophecy and the Prophetic Office (1523–1538)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2015), pp. 191–95.

[20] Timmerman, pp. 74–79.

components of exegesis, *viz*. 'the Scriptures as the Word of God, the tradition of the church, the history of the people of God, and the defense of doctrine.'[21] Luther's oft cited declaration at the Diet of Worms that 'my conscience is captive to the word of God' was intimately linked to his conviction of *sola Scriptura*. As Arthur Skevington-Wood observed of Luther: '*Sola Scriptura* was not only the battle-cry of a crusade: it was the pole-star of his own heart and mind.'[22] However, with respect to the eucharist, for Luther it was a case of *sola Scriptura* in tandem with *his* manner of interpreting Scripture.[23]

Luther's approach to Scripture was reflected in how he viewed its inspiration (*inspiratio*), its unity (*tota scriptura*), its clarity (*claritas Scripturae*) and its sufficiency (*sola Scriptura*).[24] He employed the following hermeneutical principles: personal spiritual preparation which involves the guidance of the Holy Spirit while the believer humbly uses competency in the biblical languages and reason, Scripture is its own interpreter (*Scriptura sui ipsius interpretes*) in that Scripture is its 'own light,' and, above all, the primacy of the literal sense. Through extrapolating the patristic principle of *analogia fidei* which affirmed that the message of Scripture gives a framework for interpreting its parts Luther developed a christocentric and a christological hermeneutic in line with his theology of the cross.[25] But perhaps the most characteristic hermeneutic that Luther used was to view Scripture in terms of 'law' and 'gospel.' Philip Melanchthon regarded this as his greatest achievement. This can be illustrated by what Luther wrote in 1517: 'almost all Scripture and the understanding of all theology depends on the proper understanding of law and gospel.'[26]

---

21 Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings, LW*, 56, p. 133.

22 Arthur Skevington-Wood, *Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation* (London: Tyndale, 1960), p. 7.

23 Albrecht Peters, *Commentary on Luther's Catechisms: Baptism and Lord's Supper* (Saint Louis; Concordia Publishing House, 2012), pp. 184–85.

24 Mark D. Thompson, *A Sure Ground on Which to Stand: The Relation of Authority and Interpretive Method in Luther's Approach to Scripture* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2006).

25 Not only did Luther regard Christ as the heart of the Bible but he also viewed the divine and human elements of Scripture through the lens of Christ's incarnation. See Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther and the Enduring Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016), pp. 98–131 and Jens Zimmermann, *Recovering Theological Hermeneutics: An Incarnational-Trinitarian Theory of Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), pp. 47–77.

26 Robert Kolb, 'Luther's Hermeneutics of Distinctions: Law and Gospel, Two Kinds of Righteousness, Two Realms, Freedom and Bondage' in *The Oxford*

Moreover, Luther came to the conviction that Scripture is the very word of God: 'the words and the order of the words are from God.'[27] Thus, because Luther held unswervingly to the clarity or perspicuity of Scripture he opposed any view that stated that Scripture is obscure or unclear in important matters and, therefore, requires exposition by tradition. His commitment to *claritas Scripturae* underlined his debate with Erasmus in 1524–1525 concerning the nature of the human will.[28] As Bernhard Lohse observed: 'Luther insisted that in its decisive utterances Holy Scripture is clear and unequivocal.'[29] John Webster made the following observation concerning Luther's understanding of *claritas Scripturae*:

> What is so striking about Luther's account of *claritas* is his vigorous objectivity: Scripture is plain because it is illuminated by God's saving work [...] In short, for Luther, *claritas Scripturae* is a salvation-historical affirmation, a statement about the light of the gospel in which Scripture stands and which must illuminate the reader is Scripture's clarity is to be perceived.[30]

Like Zwingli, Bullinger emphasized the importance of the Spirit for interpreting Scripture. Indeed, Zwingli's emphasis on the *prior* role of the Spirit for interpreting Scripture led to Luther regarding Zwingli and the Zurichers as *Schwärmer* (radical spiritualists) which was effectively to group the Zurichers with the Anabaptists. More so than Luther, however, Bullinger applied the rhetorical tools of humanism to interpret the message of the canon of Scripture seen as a whole unit. He discussed the key principles of rightly interpreting Scripture in Sermon I.3 of the *Decades*. Possibly with influence from Irenaeus, Bullinger focused on the classical rhetorical categories of *hypothesis*, *economy* and *recapitulation* for interpreting the

---

Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology ed. by Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel and L'Ubomír Batka (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 17.

27 Mark D. Thompson, 'Reformation Perspectives on Scripture: The Written Word of God', *Reformed Theological Review*, 57 (no. 3, 1998), pp. 106–11.

28 J.I. Packer and O.R. Johnston, *Martin Luther on the Bondage of the Will* (London: James Clarke, 1957), pp. 123–34. See Erling T. Tiegen, 'The Clarity of Scripture and Hermeneutical Principles in the Lutheran Confessions', *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 46 (1982), pp. 147–66.

29 Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), p. 194.

30 John Webster, 'Biblical Theology and the Clarity of Scripture' in *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation* ed. by Craig Bartholomew, Mary Healy, Karl Möller and Robin Parry (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), pp. 362–63.

canon as a whole as well as the individual sections of the canon.[31] In other words, Bullinger interpreted the words of the institution of the eucharist not only in the context of the gospel accounts or 1 Corinthians but also in the context of the canon as a whole. It also appears to be the case that the ministers of Zurich and Luther may well have had different understandings of Greek syntax.[32] This is illustrated by the fact that when Zwingli left Marburg he wrongly assumed that he had 'won' the debate because of his better grasp of Greek syntax which led him to declare: 'The truth has so manifestly gained the victory that if the shameless and obstinate Luther be not beaten, there never was anyone beaten, although he never ceases boasting to the contrary.'[33]

The key issue was that, despite Luther's approach to Scripture outlined above, he held resolutely to an *a priori* understanding of *hoc est corpus meum* taken in a literal manner. He argued that the text is not obscure and, therefore, requires no illumination from elsewhere in the canon. Neither Zwingli nor Bullinger could convince Luther of the relevance of the use of figures of speech elsewhere in Scripture such as Christ is the rock or Christ is the true vine. This fundamental difference in interpreting the copula *est* was a result of their different hermeneutical approaches. Luther remained unmovable while Bullinger maintained his position unswervingly. Hence there was an ongoing impasse.

V. BULLINGER AND LUTHER HAD FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE SACRAMENTS

It is not easy to assess as to what extent Luther and Bullinger might have critically viewed medieval understandings of the eucharist, especially with respect to the presence of Christ. Gary Macy has recently outlined the plethora of views expressed by medieval scholars concerning the eucharist in the centuries prior to the 16th century.[34] Bullinger was well acquainted with Lombard's *Sentences* but went back beyond even the church fathers to Scripture itself for his understanding and practice of the

31 See my article 'To What Extent was Bullinger's "The Old Faith" (1537) a Theological Tract?' *Unio cum Christo*, 3 (no. 2, 2017), pp. 137–54.

32 See Oseka's article for an analysis of the limitations of Luther's grasp of Greek syntax — Mateusz Oseka, 'Luther and Karlstadt Discussing the Syntax of *Verba Testamenti*', *Reformed Theological Review*, 73 (no. 1, 2014), pp. 28–57.

33 Samuel Simpson, *Life of Ulrich Zwingli: The Swiss Patriot and Reformer* (New York: Baker and Taylor Co., 1902), pp. 207–08.

34 Gary Macy, 'Theology of the Eucharist in the High Middle Ages' in *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages* ed. by Ian Christopher Levy, Gary Macy and Kristen van Ausdall (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 365–98.

eucharist. Luther, on the other hand, originally imbibed what was taught at the Augustinian cloister in Erfurt concerning the eucharist the practice of which was important to him for his need of regular affirmation of the forgiveness of sins. But he came to develop his own view from his interpretation of Scripture, from consideration of some medieval views and, most of all, from his rejection of the resacrifice of Christ. Prior to Trent, when the official Roman view was formulated, therefore, some Roman scholars may well have viewed Luther's understanding of the eucharist as a repackaging of what had already been mooted in the Middle Ages. Luther agreed that Christ's body was present but disagreed with the sacrifice of the mass and he rejected transubstantiation as the *method* or *mechanism* for Christ's bodily presence because it was understood through Aristotelian categories of 'substance' and 'accidents.' He stated: 'It is the true body and blood of the LORD Christ in and under the bread and wine and through Christ's Word commanded for us Christians to eat and drink.'[35]

Luther emphasized that God does not deceive in what he promises in the sacraments.[36] This is a reference to the words of institution or the *verba testamenti* which he interpreted as the *Summa et compendium Evangelii*.[37] He particularly underscored God's promise in that he gives (in the present to the believer) what he promises. In his *Babylonian Captivity* Luther almost retained penance as a sacrament because he personally wanted to be reassured regularly that his sins are (being) forgiven. Hence, for Luther, there is an intimate link between the sacraments and not only the giving of God's grace but also between the sacraments and salvation. This is reflected in his liturgies and in his catechisms. He referred to the saving work of Christ under word and sacrament.[38] In the dispute between Zwingli and Luther concerning the Eucharist, Luther complained that Zwingli's view was tantamount to what the believer does in the sacrament rather than what God has done and continues to do in the sacrament. Zwingli, on the other hand, claimed that Luther's link between the eucharist and the giving of God's grace denies the sovereignty of God who alone gives his grace to the believer. Indeed, Stephens concludes that the main

35 Peters, *Catechisms*, p. 157.

36 That 'God does not deceive' in the sacraments was also echoed by Calvin. See my 'Union with Christ and the Lord's Supper in Calvin', *Reformed Theological Review*, 75 (no. 2, 2016), p. 112.

37 Peters, *Catechisms*, pp. 165, 166.

38 Peters, *Catechisms*, pp. 43–48.

issue at Marburg was not the sacraments *per se* but, rather, salvation.[39] This analysis of Marburg was echoed by Vermigli.[40]

Luther's view of the link between the sacraments and salvation is reflected in the analysis of Robert Kolb and Charles Arand of Luther's understanding of baptism in that, for Luther, '*Baptism is God's sacramental Word that initiates the relationship between the heavenly Father and his reborn child*. As Luther asserted in his *Small Catechism*, children early in their lives should learn that baptism "brings about forgiveness of sins, redeems from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation to all who believe it, as the words and promise of God declare."'[41] With respect to the eucharist, Albrecht Peters points out that in the *Large Catechism* Luther offers the insight: 'Christ's body that was offered is not only a "certain pledge and sign" of the testament of the forgiveness of sins, it is in reality "even that selfsame treasure," which the Lord instituted for us back then upon Golgotha and the He distributes to us today in the Lord's Supper.'[42]

Bullinger, on the other hand, had a fundamentally different understanding of the eucharist from that of Rome which, he claimed, had strayed from Scripture and the early church fathers. More so than other reformers he emphasized the parallels between circumcision and baptism and between passover and the eucharist.[43] They have the same 'substance' while 'in signs they are diverse, but in the thing signified equal.'[44] Just as passover looked back to God's act of redemption at the time of Moses and looked forward to its fulfilment in Christ, the true passover lamb, so the eucharist not only looks back at God enacting his plan for the salvation of the world but also looks forward to the consummation of God's plan at the *eschaton*. Bullinger thus viewed the eucharist primarily as a covenant sign and seal. In his commentary of 1 Corinthians he referred to the eucharist as a 'sign of the eternal covenant'[45] where the believer focuses on what

---

39 W. Peter Stephens, 'The Soteriological Motive in the Eucharistic Controversy' in *Calvin: Erbe und Auftrag: Festschrift für Wilhelm Neuser zu seinem 65, Geburtstag*, ed. by Willem van't Spijker (Kampen: Kok, 1991), pp. 203–13.

40 Peter Martyr Vermigli, *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation: On the Eucharist 1549* (Kirksville, Missouri: Truman State University Press, 2000), p. 121.

41 Robert Kolb and Charles P. Arand, *The Genius of Luther's Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), p. 190.

42 Peters, *Catechism*, p. 191.

43 Joe Mock, 'Bullinger and the Lord's Supper', pp. 57–78.

44 Peter Opitz (ed.), *Sermonum Decades quinque de potissimus Christianae religionis capitibus (1552)* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2008), p. 923. Unless otherwise stated, translations are those of the author.

45 Luca Baschera (ed.), *Heinrich Bullinger Kommentare zu den Neutestamentlichen Briefen: Röm–1Kor–2Kor* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2012), p. 383.

God has done in demonstrating his grace (the completed work of Christ on the cross, his resurrection and his ascension to the right hand of God), on what God is doing in the present (in the life of the believer) and on what God will do in the future (eschatological perspective). The eucharist for Bullinger was effectively a covenant renewal ceremony. This is illustrated by his understanding that 'the Lord himself by the institution of the sacraments has bound himself unto us, and we again by the partaking of them do bind ourselves to him and to all the saints.'[46] This is further seen in the fact that in Zurich the eucharist was celebrated three times a year (Easter, Pentecost and Christmas) paralleling the three pilgrimage feasts of the Old Testament where every male was required to come before the Lord at the temple in Jerusalem.[47] Hence Bullinger emphasized the *koinonia* or fellowship of the elect in the eucharist in the context of union with Christ. This is a marginal aspect of the eucharist for Luther.[48]

The eschatological perspective is not lacking in Luther's understanding of the eucharist. He did acknowledge that the eucharist helps believers as they battle against sin, the flesh and the world.[49] However, it was Bullinger who particularly underscored the eschatological dimension of the eucharist. This was in accord with his constant emphasis of spirituality in light of the last judgment.[50] Several severe winters in the mid 16th century were cited by Bullinger as signs of the impending last judgment. This is not to mention the number of his own family members who died as a result of the plague. Thus Bullinger highlighted that the believer should focus on the judgment to come each time they partake of the eucharist. Bullinger saw the eucharist as a New Testament covenant renewal ceremony that encouraged the believer to look back at what Christ has achieved on the cross as well as to look forward to what Christ will achieve for the believer at the consummation when he comes bodily in his glory. In this context, Bullinger constantly urged believers to live *integer* in a right covenant relationship with God which was a major feature in all his works.

---

46 Opitz, *Decades*, p. 882.

47 There was a fourth occasion on the celebration of Zurich's martyrs, Felix and Regula (11 September).

48 Peters, *Catechisms*, p. 221.

49 Peters, *Catechsims*, p. 215.

50 Bruce Gordon, '"Welcher nit gloub der is schon verdampt": Heinrich Bullinger and the Spirituality of the Last Judgement', *Zwingliana*, 29 (2001), pp. 29–53.

VI. BULLINGER AND LUTHER DIFFERED IN THEIR CHRISTOLOGY

That Bullinger and Luther differed in their christology is particularly evident in their understanding of the two natures of the resurrected and risen Christ. What was at stake was Niceaean theology. In this connection, McLelland concluded that the issue of christology was the major dispute at Marburg with respect to the eucharist.[51] Luther insisted that Christ was present bodily in the eucharist through the *communicatio idiomatum* in the context of the ubiquity of Christ's body. Zwingli complained that this was a Eutychian manner of viewing Christ. Bullinger emphasized that Christ was present spiritually but that his body was at the right hand of God the Father in heaven. He differentiated between bodily eating, spiritual eating and sacramental eating. Luther argued that this was a Nestorian way of regarding Christ. What underlay the fundamental difference between them was the salvation-historical perspective of the incarnation and the return of Christ at the *eschaton* with his glorified body. The difference between Zurich and Wittenberg was how to grapple with the tension of the absence and the presence of Christ in the eucharist. Douglas Farrow concluded that Luther was influenced by Origen in this whereas Zwingli and Bullinger followed the lead of Irenaeus whom they deemed closer to a right understanding of the relevant biblical texts.[52] Bullinger and the Zurichers feared that Luther's concept of the ubiquity of Christ's body meant a view of the incarnation that resulted in Jesus not being made man in the exact way that we are. That would have ramifications for understanding the atonement.

Bullinger and Luther also differed in their use and understanding of the church fathers. Although, for example, both often referred to Augustine, nonetheless, they cited him to different effect. Bullinger, for his part, significantly made several references to Theodoret because he adjudged him to have rightly interpreted Scripture concerning the two natures of Christ.[53] Theodoret does not appear to have been cited much by the reformers, but, as was his custom, Bullinger chose to refer to the fathers

---

[51] J.C. McLelland, 'Meta-Zwingli or Anti-Zwingli? Bullinger and Calvin in Eucharistic Accord', in *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism vol. 13*, ed. by Richard C. Gamble (New York: Garland Publishing, 1992), p. 180.

[52] Douglas Farrow, *Ascension and Ecclesia: On the Significance of the Doctrine of the Ascension for Ecclesiology and Christian Cosmology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), pp. 173–75.

[53] Mark Taplin, 'Patristics and Polemic: Josias Simler's History of Early Church Christological Disputes' in *Following Zwingli: Applying the Past in Reformation Zurich*, ed. by Luca Baschera, Bruce Gordon and Christian Moser (Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 41–80.

whenever he adjudged them to have correctly interpreted Scripture. In this connection, it is significant that Vermigli also made much use of Theodoret.[54]

VII. CONCLUSION

The bone of contention between Bullinger and Luther was that, while he acknowledged that Christ was present spiritually in the eucharist, he was unswervingly opposed to any notion of Christ's *bodily* presence. He declared that Christ was present spiritually in the eucharist because 'we do not have the Supper without Christ.'[55] Indeed, he affirmed the 'spiritual, divine and quickening presence of Christ' in the eucharist.[56]

Despite this theological difference between them, Bullinger continued to display deference to Luther as a person and patiently waited for Luther to be convinced by his exegetical arguments for the eucharist. Although clearly distancing himself from Luther's view, Bullinger did not refer to Luther by name in the *Decades* but, rather, referred to him as an 'adversary.'[57] But there was no holding back in referring to Luther's view in terms of 'crying out and repeatedly crying out, "This is my body,' "This is my body;' "This is," "This is," "This is," "This is," "Is," "Is," "Is" while we repeat, "The word was made flesh," "was made," "was made."'[58]

Bullinger sought for Zurich to remain in communion with Wittenberg despite their radical differences concerning the eucharist. He yearned for mutual respect and for receiving one another as members of God's family. The manner in which he responded to Luther's *Brief Confession Concerning the Holy Sacrament* indicated that he was patiently and earnestly waiting for Wittenberg to embrace what he believed to be the right biblical interpretation and practice of the eucharist. Interestingly, Bishop John Hooper (1495–1555) who was strongly influenced by Luther's early works when he was at Oxford and who was then later convinced by the writings of both Zwingli and Bullinger wrote strong words about Luther in his letters to Bullinger and others. For example:

---

54 Douglas H. Shantz, 'Vermigli on Tradition and the Fathers: Patristic Perspectives from his Commentary on 1 Corinthians' in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, ed. by F. James III (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 117.

55 *The Second Helvetic Confession*, chapter XXI.

56 Opitz, *Decades*, p. 1026.

57 Ibid., p. 1021.

58 Ibid., p. 1017.

> Let controversy be settled by the authority of the word, Let no one defend his opinion with obstinacy; but let us rather return unto the way of truth, and humbly acknowledge our errors, than continue always to go on in error without repentance, lest we should seem to have been in the wrong […] I entreat you, my master, not to say or write any thing against charity or godliness for the sake of Luther, or burden the consciences of men with his words on the holy supper. Although I readily acknowledge with thankfulness the gifts of God in him who is now no more, yet he was not without his faults. I do not say this by way of reproach of the departed individual, because I know that no living man is without blame, and that we all stand in need of the grace of God.[59]

The above is extracted from Hooper's letter to Bucer dated 19 June 1548. The Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester illustrated his commitment to *sola Scriptura* and *claritas Scripturae* particularly when confronted with the *Six Articles* (1539). Moreover, he was willing to be martyred for his unswerving convictions, thus testifying that a correct biblical understanding of the Lord's Supper is at the centre of Reformed faith and conduct.

This article has sought to evaluate afresh the differences between Wittenberg and Zurich with respect to the eucharist. The respective charisma of Luther, on the one hand, and of Zwingli, on the other hand was clearly a major factor. Secondarily, the dynamics of the differing political situations was not an insignificant factor. However, the most fundamental factor was the difference in the way Scripture was interpreted and applied in the life of the church. Bishop Hooper has been cited as one who was originally influenced by Luther and the arguments presented by Luther for his understanding and practice of the eucharist. But through his study of Scripture Hooper came to the conclusion that Zurich was closer to a correct understanding of Scripture with respect to the eucharist. Keith Mathison has commented that English speaking Presbyterian or Reformed churches have been too influenced by Zurich's understanding of the eucharist rather than the teaching of Calvin which he adjudges to be the closest to Scripture.[60] Mathison's aim is to reclaim 'Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.' This article seeks to stimulate fresh evaluation of what Scripture teaches about the eucharist through considering, in particular, the thought of Bullinger.

---

[59] Hastings Robinson (ed.), *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation: Written During the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary, Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich* (Cambridge: The University Press for the Parker Society, 1846), pp. 45–46.

[60] Keith A. Mathison, *Given for You: Reclaiming Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2002).

AMO UT INTELLIGAM (I LOVE SO THAT I MAY UNDERSTAND): THE ROLE OF LOVE IN T.F. TORRANCE'S THEOLOGICAL EPISTEMOLOGY

Christopher Woznicki

Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California, USA

Most contemporary discussions about theological epistemology have focused upon discussions about foundationalism, coherentism, realism, anti-realism, and basic beliefs, among other topics. However, with a few exceptions, one topic that has received noticeably little attention is the role that love plays in our knowledge of God. This essay turns to the work of T.F. Torrance to show how love may play a crucial role in our theological epistemology.

Here I show that Torrance's understanding of the Holy Spirit's role in atonement provides us with the tools to form a theological epistemology grounded in the concept of love. I begin by providing a brief overview of Torrance's epistemology which features two important principles: 1) all genuine knowledge involves a cognitive union of the mind with its object and 2) knowledge of an object is only in accordance with that object's nature. Having examined Torrance's epistemology, I then provide a brief outline of Torrance's theory of atonement. I proceed to address the first principle and explore the Holy Spirit's role in enabling believers to enter the union of love necessary to know God. Following this I turn to the second principle and argue that given God's loving nature we must approach God in love and in a loving manner in order to know him. Furthermore, I show how the Holy Spirit enables us to approach God in love. I conclude by noting some of the important implications these principles have for the task of theology.

1. TORRANCE'S THEOLOGICAL EPISTEMOLOGY

Torrance is notorious for presenting an epistemology which is dense and difficult to understand.[1] In fact not a few trees have been killed in

[1] Torrance has written much on the subject of theological epistemology, for some examples see T.F. Torrance, *Reality and Evangelical Theology* (Philadelphia, Westminster Press); T.F. Torrance, *Theology in Reconstruction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965); T.F. Torrance, *Theological Science* (New York:

attempts to clarify his 'philosophy of theological science.'[2] However, Torrance's clearest articulation of his epistemology can be found in *The Mediation of Christ*. There Torrance begins his discussion of the mediating work of Christ by outlining what he takes to be a major epistemological problem. According to Torrance the epistemological problem is that 'aspects of reality that are naturally integrated have been torn apart from each other, with damaging effect in different areas of knowledge.'[3] This means that in the areas of philosophy and science 'the knowledge of reality was artificially cut short at appearances and what we can logically deduce from our critical observations of them.'[4] In essence the problem is that an inadequate theory of how form is integrated in knowing has led to an overly analytic, deductive, abstract, mechanistic way of knowing.[5] Torrance believes that this abstract and mechanistic way of knowing is best exemplified in the physical sciences. For instance, Isaac Newton viewed science as an inquiry into the causal relations between material realities, then on the basis of 'empirical data' he deduced or abstracted natural laws. One problem with this approach was that Newton could not deduce or abstract theoretical elements (like absolute time or space) from observing causation. Another problem with this approach was that the analytic isolation of empirical data tends to efface (or ignore) complex relations between things that are defining or characteristic of what those

---

Bloomsbury, 2000); T.F Torrance, *Transformation and Convergence in the Frame of Knowledge: Explorations in the Interrelations of Scientific and Theological Enterprise* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984).

2 See the following examples: E. Colyer, 'The Integration of Form in Theology', in *How to Read T.F. Torrance: Understanding His Trinitarian & Scientific Theology* (Downers Grove, InterVarsity Press, 2001). Chs. 2–4 in M. Habets, *Theology in Transposition: A Constructive Appraisal of T.F. Torrance* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013). T. McCall, 'Ronald Thiemann, Thomas Torrance and Epistemological Doctrines of Revelation', *IJST* 6 (2004), 148–68. B. Myers, 'The Stratification of Knowledge in the Thought of T.F. Torrance', *SJT* 61 (2008), 1–5. P.M. Achtemeier, 'The Truth of Tradition: Critical Realism in the Thought of Alexander Alasdair MacIntyre and T.F. Torrance', *SJT* 47 (1996), 355–74. J.D. Morrison, 'Heidegger, Correspondence Truth and the Realist Theology of Thomas Forsyth Torrance', *EVQ* 69 (1997), 139–55.

3 T.F.Torrance, *The Mediation of Christ* (Colorado Springs, Co: Helmers and Howard Publishers, 1992), p. 1.

4 Torrance, *The Mediation of Christ*, p. 1.

5 Colyer provides a Torrancean account of how form and knowledge were disintegrated in the Early Modern Period. He traces this dualistic split beginning with Rene Descartes, moving to Isaac Newton, David Hume, and culminating in the work of Kant. See Colyer, *How to Read T.F. Torrance: Understanding His Trinitarian & Scientific Theology*, pp. 325–31.

realities are. However, according to Torrance some scientists like James Clerk Maxwell and Albert Einstein have turned away from 'severely analytical and abstractive modes of thought inherited from classical physics and observational science' and have developed 'dynamic, relational, and holistic ways of thinking more in accordance with the modes of connection and behavior actually found in nature.'[6]

The problem of analytic, abstract, mechanistic patterns of thought has also affected theology and biblical studies. For instance, consider certain strands of biblical studies which attempt to isolate various textual and pretextual sources in order to arrive at 'authentic historical data' on which to construct a 'historical Jesus.'[7] This is the method of inquiry which scholars like the ones involved in the Jesus Seminar have employed. Yet there has also been a turn away from severely analytical and abstractive modes of thought in Biblical studies. Richard Horsley, for example, has argued for a relational-contextual approach to historical Jesus studies.[8]

1.1 Two Basic Principles of Knowledge

The notion that the nature or the form of a thing and the method of inquiry into that thing must somehow be integrated leads Torrance to assert two epistemological principles. The first principle is that 'all genuine knowledge involves a cognitive union of the mind with its object, and calls for the removal of any estrangement or alienation that may obstruct or distort it.'[9] Let us call this the Cognitive Union Principle (CUP). Torrance provides several examples of how the CUP is true. His first exam-

6 Torrance, *The Mediation of Christ*, p. 2.

7 'Various versions of this kind of approach tend to tear the natural cohesion of scripture (form in being) by severing the New Testament from the Old, breaking up the gospels into various fragmentary sources, and separating various books within the New Testament form one another […] This analytic isolation of data effaces the intrinsic interrelations defining or characteristic of Jesus Christ and the gospel.' Colyer, *How to Read T.F. Torrance*, p. 347.

8 In *The Prophet Jesus and the Renewal of Israel* Horsley says that a mechanistic, abstract, and atomistic approach to the study of Jesus, exemplified by the scholars in the Jesus Seminar, is problematic. The first problem with the abstract/atomistc approach is that nobody communicates to other people in 'isolated sayings.' The second problem is that the meaning of a saying or story always depends on its context. The third problem is that if fails to approach the gospels are whole stories, not just stories strung together. Instead of this approach Horsley says that we must discern a more adequate, relational, and contextual approach to Jesus as a significant figure. R. Horsely, *The Prophet Jesus and the Renewal of Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2012), pp. 67–78.

9 Torrance, *The Mediation of Christ*, p. 25.

ple comes from the study of mathematics. He cites the Swiss mathematician, Ferdinand Gonseth, who insisted that a good mathematician must be dedicated to integrity and rigor in mathematics.[10] Gonseth believed this could not but affect the mathematician's whole character. Torrance agrees with Gonseth's claim and says that even in mathematics a certain 'sanctity' of mind is required. Torrance observes this 'sanctity of mind' in mathematicians and scientists such as Pascal, Maxwell, and Einstein. The second example Torrance gives is friendship. He says that we are not able to know other people except in so far as we enter into reciprocal relations with them through which we ourselves are affected.

The second principle is that 'we may know something only in accordance with its nature.'[11] Let us call this the Knowledge-Nature Principle (KNP). According to the KNP, the nature of that thing prescribes the mode of knowing appropriate to it and determines the way we ought to behave towards that object.[12] Personal beings, for instance, require personal modes of knowledge and behaviour.[13] The way we come to know personal beings is through 'rapprochement or communion of minds characterized by mutual respect, trust, and love.'[14] This is not only true of other human beings, it is also true of our knowledge of God. Thus, Torrance says, 'God may be known only in a godly way, in accordance with his nature as God.'[15] God is by nature holy, loving, and worthy of praise thus to know God one must approach God in a holy, loving, and worshipful way. In other words, 'Knowing God requires cognitive union with him in which our whole being is affected by his love and holiness.'[16]

Having stated Torrance's two basic principles of knowledge, we shall now turn to his theology of atonement.

---

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid.

12 E. Colyer, *The Nature of Doctrine in T.F. Torrance's Theology* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2001), p. 15.

13 One might wonder how the KNP applies to non-personal objects, for instance, how does the KNP apply to knowledge of H_2O? Does this mean in order to know H_2O I must come to know it 'water-ly?' Like theological science, the natural sciences will have their own particular scientific requirements and material procedures which will be determined by the nature of the empirical objects they study. Like theological science, natural science must be faithful to the nature of the object or subject matter under investigation.

14 Torrance, *The Mediation of Christ*, p. 25.

15 Ibid., p. 26.

16 Ibid., p. 26.

2. TORRANCE AND ATONEMENT

According to Torrance the person and work of Christ cannot be separated. For Torrance the hypostatic union (person) affects every aspect of atonement (work).[17] In this section we will examine what Torrance has to say regarding three major aspects of atonement in the New Testament and how the hypostatic union is the driving force behind these aspects. Doing this will help bring clarity to his theological epistemology.

2.1 Three Aspects of Atonement in Torrance's Theology

The first aspect of atonement that Torrance treats in *Atonement* is justification.[18] Let us briefly look at how this works in light of the hypostatic union. Torrance argues that justification is a twofold act. On God's side it means to judge or condemn in order to put right and it means to deem right. On humanity's side there are also two actions that must be performed, there must be confession of God's righteousness and there must be obedience to it. Torrance suggests that these four things are all fulfilled in Christ. In Christ humanity (in virtue of anhypostasis) acknowledges its sinfulness.[19] In Christ, God judges humanity as sinful and puts it in the right therefore revealing his own righteousness. At the same time, in Christ, humanity (enhypostasis) offers up perfect obedience and faithfulness to God. Finally, in Christ, God deems humanity as being in the right. Thus, Jesus is the judge and the judged in one person.

The second aspect of atonement that Torrance examines is reconciliation. In contrast to atonement that justifies, being a legal relation, atonement as reconciliation is the recreating of the bond of union between God

---

[17] For a more in-depth overview of Torrance's understanding of the relationship between the person and work of Christ see A. Radcliff, *The Claim of Humanity in Christ* (Eugene, Pickwick, 2016), pp. 53–73.

[18] T.F. Torrance, *Atonement: The Person and Work of Christ*, ed. Robert T. Walker (Downers Grove, Ill: IVP Academic, 2009).

[19] *Anhypostasis* refers to the fact that the humanity of Jesus had no independent reality of its own apart from the incarnation of the Son and *enhypostasis* refers to the fact that the humanity of Jesus did have real personal being in the person of the Son as a result of the incarnation. These definitions presented by Torrance can be a bit confusing. However it is helpful to think of *anhypostasis* and *enhypostasis* as referring to a shared human nature and an individual human nature respectively. In *Incarnation* Torrance says that *anhypostasia* refers to the fact that Jesus Christ took possession of human nature, the 'same or common human nature.' This means that there is a metaphysical solidarity between Jesus and all humanity. *Enhypostasia* on the other hand refers to the fact that Jesus came as an individual human being, having a personal mode of existence.

and humanity and humanity and God. In other words, atonement here means 'at-one-ment' both ontologically and relationally.[20]

Torrance argues that 'reconciliation stresses the fact that God came down to our estate in order to assume us into fellowship with himself, and to effect such a oneness between the sinner and God, that the sinner is exalted to share with God in his own divine life.'[21] We might ask, how does this happen? Once again, we must say that the key to answering this question is the hypostatic union. In Christ we have the turning of God to humanity and the turning of humanity to God. Unlike other human beings, however, Christ 'lives his life in perfect oneness with God, so achieving reconciliation of God to humanity and of humanity to God.'[22]

The fact that reconciliation needs to occur between God and humanity implies that there is a breach between humanity and God. Christ comes to heal this existential breach. However, in order for reconciliation to occur, Christ must bring all of humanity into union with God. Christ must carry human nature as a whole (*anhypostasis*) and he must carry the human life in all its personal and existential reality (*enhypostasis*) into the life of God. In the hypostatic union, both of these elements are brought together so that the whole of human nature is reconciled to God. It must be stressed that for reconciliation to occur, the oneness of God and human nature must be carried through the entire life of Jesus. It must take place over the whole course of his life from birth to death.[23] The oneness of God and human nature is carried through to its completion in the resurrection, so that after the resurrection human nature and God are united in Christ for eternity.

The third aspect of atonement that Torrance treats is redemption. For Torrance redemption is a comprehensive term regarding our salvation through justification, expiation, and reconciliation in Christ. It is eschatological and teleological. It is the consummation of God's redeeming purposes in the new creation. It tells us that glorification is an essential part of our salvation.[24] According to Torrance this act of redemption is completed and actualized by the pouring out of the Spirit to the church so that the church can participate in the atonement that Christ has undertaken on its behalf. It is through the Spirit that we are incorporated into him; it is through the incarnation that God is incorporated into us. Thus,

---

20 Torrance, *Atonement: The Person and Work of Christ*, p. 137.
21 Ibid., p. 145.
22 Ibid., p. 148.
23 Ibid., p. 228.
24 Ibid., p. 172.

at Pentecost, double incorporation occurs, meaning that redemption has been completed.[25]

2.2 A Summary of Torrance's Atonement Theory

According to Torrance atonement is the recreation of the bond of union between God and humanity. The recreation of this bond is accomplished objectively through the hypostatic union (from incarnation through resurrection) but it is actualized subjectively for the believer through the work of the Holy Spirit who unites us to Christ and hence unites the human nature to divine nature. Having described Torrance's understanding of the atonement we are now in a position to see how his doctrine of atonement provides the basis for an alternative theological epistemology.

3. ATONEMENT AND EPISTEMOLOGY

3.1 Cognitive Union and the Love of God

We have noted that Torrance presents two basic epistemological principles: The first being that genuine knowledge involves cognitive union of the mind with its object and calls for the removal of any estrangement or alienation that may obstruct or distort it. This cognitive union with God, which is necessary for knowing God, is accomplished in two ways through the atonement. First, the possibility for humans to even know God is opened up by the hypostatic union. Humanity, because of sin is alienated from God. Thus in order for humanity to know God all estrangement and alienation must be removed, that is, humanity must be reconciled to God. This reconciliation between humanity and God occurs in the atonement, whose basis is the Hypostatic Union. Through the atonement there is an 'at-one-ment' both ontologically and relationally between humanity and the divine. Christ carries human nature as a whole (*anhypostasis* as opposed to *enhypostasis*) into the life of God. It is because of the anhypostatic union that it is possible for human nature to know God. However, knowledge of God is more than a mere possibility. Individual humans actually know God. According to Torrance the pouring out of the Spirit belongs to atonement. The pouring out of the Spirit

[25] Here we see how much Torrance is indebted to Patristic thought, especially to the thought of Athanasius. Note the similarity between this doctrine of 'double incorporation' and what Athanasius has to say about the topic: 'Because of the grace of the Spirit which has been given to us, in him we come to be, and he in us; and since it is the Spirit of God, therefore through his becoming in us, reasonably are we, as having the Spirit considered to be in God and thus is God in us.' (*Discourses* 3.24) This quote from Athanasius was cited in P. Leithart, *Athanasius* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), p. 69.

into the believer is not a separate act of atonement, rather, it 'is atonement actualizing itself, really and subjectively within the personal lives of men and women.'[26] If the pouring out of the Spirit into the believer is the basis for the individual believer's union with God (through union with Christ) then we can say that the individual who is united to Christ experiences the union with God which is necessary in order to know God without any alienation or estrangement which distorts knowledge of God. In other words, the Spirit's role in atonement makes it possible for an individual believer to know God.

The Spirit's role in bringing about the cognitive union necessary to know God is the key to understanding the first way in which love plays a role in our knowledge of God. As it was noted, God draws near to us and draws us near to him and brings us into union with himself through the gift of the Spirit. As human beings become united with God they are able to really know the one God in the inner relations of his divine being as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.[27]

This 'entering' into the inner relations between God is crucial to knowing God as God really is. In *The Christian Doctrine of God* Torrance says that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity simply means 'that God himself is love.'[28] He elaborates upon this by saying that God's being is an eternal movement of love which consists of the love with which the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit ceaselessly love one another. In other words, God's love *ad intra* and *ad extra* reveals something about the inmost nature of God's being. What role does the Holy Spirit play in a love based theological epistemology? Torrance tell us that in giving us his one Spirit, who proceeds from the Father through the Son and sheds abroad in our hearts the very love which God himself is, God reveals his innermost being to us. God reveals the love that flows between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; God reveals that he himself is love. This is something we could not know unless we are an active part of this movement of love, which as we have seen is actualized in the life of the believer through the work of the Holy Spirit.

3.2 Love and Knowing God According to God's Nature

Torrance's second principle is that 'we may know something only in accordance with its nature.'[29] Assuming that Torrance is correct in stating this principle then we should say that in order to know God we must

[26] Torrance, *Atonement: The Person and Work of Christ*, p. 189.
[27] Torrance, *The Mediation of Christ*, p. 117.
[28] Torrance, *The Christian Doctrine of God*, p. 162.
[29] Torrance, *The Mediation of Christ*, p. 25.

know God in a godly way, that is according to his nature. It is not easy to spell out what exactly this means, however we know, in an uncontroversial way, that God is holy and that God is love. In fact, the conviction that God is first and foremost a God of love seems to be at the very heart of the Christian faith. Consider the following words of John Wesley,

> It is not written, "God is justice," or "God is truth:" (Although he is just and true in all of his ways:) But it is written, "God is love," love in the abstract, without bounds; and "there is no end of his goodness." His love extends even to those who neither love nor fear him.[30]

If it is central to God's nature to be holy and loving as Scripture and our intuitions tell us, then we must approach knowing God in holiness and in love.[31] Thankfully the Holy Spirit progressively actualizes holiness and love in the life of the believer. Scripture tells us that the Holy Spirit is the one who makes us holy and conforms us to the image of Christ.[32] The holiness which we need to approach God in knowledge has been made possible by Christ. Through the course of his incarnation, Christ has sanctified himself for our sake.[33] The participation in Christ which is necessary for believers to partake in that holiness, however, is made possible by the Holy Spirit.[34] Yet, the Holy Spirit does not just conform us to the holiness of God, thus enabling us to approach God in holiness, the Holy Spirit also produces love for God within believers. Calvin says of the Holy

---

30 Cited in Jerry Walls, *Hell: The Logic of Damnation* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1992), p. 83.

31 The idea that we must approach God in love in order to known him is not explicitly developed in Torrance's theology. Although Torrance does say that, 'knowing God requires cognitive union with him in which our whole being is affected by his love and holiness,' he does not fully develop this idea. The rest of this paragraph develops this Torrancean idea.

32 See 1 Peter 1:2, Romans 15:16, 1 Corinthians 6:11, and 2 Corinthians 3:18.

33 'The Torrances root sanctification objectively with justification in Christ. We have been sanctified once-for-all through Christ's vicarious humanity.' Radcliff, *The Claim of Humanity in Christ*, p. 140.

34 Radcliff explains that, 'the Torrances believe that the outworking of this sanctification found objectively with justification in Christ comes as we participate by the Holy Spirit in Christ. The role of the Holy Spirit is to turn us out of ourselves to share in this sanctification found definitively in Christ.' Radcliff, *The Claim of Humanity in Christ*, pp. 136–7. Torrance's own words are also instructive here. Torrance explains: 'Because the church is the body of Christ in which he dwells, the temple of the Holy Spirit in which God is present, its members live the very life of Christ through the Holy Spirit, partaking of and living out the holy life of God.' Torrance, *Atonement*, p. 387.

Spirit, that he is 'persistently boiling away and burning our viscous and inordinate desires, he enflames our hearts with the love of God and with zealous devotion.'[35] The Holy Spirit produces affections towards God; a desire for God, a desire to know him, to have a personal relationship with him, and a desire to achieve some sort of union with him. In other words, the Holy Spirit produces the affection of love towards God, which is needed in order to approach God in a loving manner. Finally, Scripture also tells us 'God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us.'[36] Thomas Schreiner suggests that this passage implies that the Spirit, who should not be sharply distinguished from the love of God himself, has the unique ministry of filling believers with the love of God.[37] Although this love is both knowledge of divine love towards us and the kindling of love in the believer to love God in return, in this passage it refers primarily to the knowledge of God's love for us.[38] Thus it is the case that the out pouring of the Spirit, which according to Torrance is a part of atonement, enables us to have knowledge of God in accordance with the KNP.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR THEOLOGICAL METHOD

Thus far I have shown how Torrance's work can shed some light on the role that love may play in our theological epistemology. I will conclude by spelling out some important implications for the task of theology that we can draw out from our discussion of Torrance's epistemology.[39]

4.1 Implications for Justifying our Religious Beliefs

The first implication of Torrance's theological epistemology is that his epistemology shifts the conversation away from typical internalist accounts of

---

35 Quoted in A. Plantinga, *Knowledge and Christian Belief* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), p. 72.

36 Romans 5:5 (See also 1 Thessalonians 4:9).

37 T. Schreiner, *Romans* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), p. 257.

38 See Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947), p. 193. Here Calvin says, 'This knowledge of divine love towards us is instilled into our hearts by the Spirit of God; for the good things which God has prepared for his servants are hid from the ears and eyes and the minds of men, and the Spirit alone is he who can reveal them.'

39 Even though I limit myself to exploring the theological implications of Torrance's epistemology, exploring the implications that Torrance's epistemology has for other disciplines would be a worthwhile task. This task, however, shall be left for another day.

justification towards an externalist account. Typically, most accounts of theological epistemology have been based upon either some sort of foundationalism or coherentism. Accounts based upon these positions tend to be internalist accounts of justification. Foundationalism states that an agent can justify mediated beliefs by reference to basic beliefs, both of which are something that the agent holds to internally. Coherentism states that an agent can justify any belief by reference to other beliefs in her set of beliefs. That is, both of these accounts of justification agree that justification 'consists in reasons or evidence that are somehow internal to the agent's cognitive perspective, and upon which she bases her belief, so that she has a justified belief.'[40] Torrance's account is quite different from these accounts because instead of appealing to other beliefs in order to justify religious claims, Torrance shifts towards appealing to an external state of affairs in order to give warrant to such religious claims.

Consider the following proposition, which is one definition of what externalism might amount to:

1. It is false that justification comes by way of the internal cognitive perspective of the knower. In order to be justified in one's belief in B_1 one must come to believe B_1 while the believer can meet a certain state of affairs.

Proposition 1 is a state account of justification (i.e. the knower must be in a certain state in order to be able to claim that her beliefs are justified).[41] According to this view, what allows the believer to justify her beliefs consists of an objective relationship between the agent's cognitive faculty and external reality.[42] In other words, the agent must be in a certain cognitive state in order to be able to justify her beliefs.[43] As an example of this state view of justification we may say that a person's belief that their perception (e.g. I see a kitten) is only justified if they are in such a state which their cognitive and perceptive faculties are unhindered.

As we have described the internalist and externalist accounts of justification it becomes clear that T.F. Torrance holds to an externalist state account of justification. For Torrance all genuine knowledge involves

40 J. Adam Carter, J. Kallestrup, S. Orestis Palmeros, and D. Pritchard, 'Varieties of Externalism' *Philosophical Issues* 24, no. 1 (October 2014), 66.

41 This is just one of several forms of an externalist account of justification.

42 Carter, Kallestrup, Palmeros, and Pritchard, 'Varieties of Externalism', p. 67.

43 Although I am using the language of justification here, what I am stating has affinities with what Alvin Plantinga calls warrant. Plantinga argues that warrant is the property enough of which is what distinguishes knowledge from mere true belief. Here I am saying that meeting CUP and KNP is partly what makes belief about God warranted.

cognitive union of the mind with its object calls for the removal of any estrangement or alienation that may obstruct or distort it. When we apply this principle to our beliefs about God, we can say that for Torrance we are only justified in holding to our theological beliefs if we are in a state of cognitive union with God. Thus,

2. Theological belief B_1 is justified if and only if the knower is in a state of cognitive union with God.

How does that state of union come to be? That state of cognitive union with God, which is necessary for knowing God, is accomplished through the objective aspect of atonement (Christ's person and work) and the subjective aspect of atonement (the Spirit's work in uniting us to Christ). Thus, Torrance's account of justification can finally be stated as,

3. Theological belief B_1 is justified if and only if the knower is in a state of cognitive union, which is accomplished in Christ and the Spirit's work of atonement for the believer.

This is a radically different account of justification than foundationalism and coherentism since both of these views justify theological beliefs in terms of other beliefs, yet Torrance's account of justification justifies theological beliefs in terms of a state of being united to Christ. This is clearly a version of (1), except that what it means to have one's cognitive state unhindered is defined in reference to a reconciled relationship, i.e. a relationship of reciprocal love, with the object of knowledge (i.e. God) rather than some other account of what it means to have one's cognitive state unhindered (e.g. one is sober, one has not experienced brain damage, etc.). Thus given the fact that Torrance grounds his justification in the Christ and the Holy Spirit's union creating work of atonement we might say that for Torrance, the justification of our religious beliefs is found in the loving union we experience with God.

4.2 Implications for the Theologian's Task

In addition to having implications for how we justify our religious beliefs, Torrance's atonement based epistemology has implications for how a theologian goes about doing her work. As we have seen, genuine knowledge of God necessitates union with God that is not marred by alienation or estrangement. If alienation or estrangement exists, the person attempting to know God will not be able to genuinely know him. Atonement, through the hypostatic union and through the work of the Holy Spirit, removes this alienation and estrangement. It follows that if a person has not appropriated the work of atonement, through the double incorporation carried out by the Holy Spirit, then alienation and estrangement still

exist. Therefore, it is impossible for the person who has not appropriated atonement to genuinely know God.

The first implication of this is that if a person is not in a loving relationship with God she cannot properly do theology. How does this follow? As we have seen, unless a person is in a state of cognitive union with God, accomplished and effected in Christ and the Spirit's work of atonement, then that person cannot know God. We might put this in a slightly different manner, we may say that a person who has not entered into a loving relationship with God free from alienation, i.e. who has not accepted the fact that while we were still sinners God loved us (Romans 5:8), that we live by faith in the Son of God who loved us and gave himself for us (Galatians 2:20), and that by God's great love even when we were dead we were made alive in Christ (Ephesians 2:4–5), cannot *really* know God. This does not mean that the person who is not in a loving relationship with God cannot hold true beliefs about God, it simply means that these beliefs do not count as knowledge. These beliefs do not count as knowledge because they are not warranted. They are not warranted because they do not meet the necessary conditions for knowledge posited by the CUP and KNP. Given that these beliefs do not amount to actual knowledge of God we can conclude that theology which is done apart from being in Christ is not actual knowledge of God, even if it is 'correct' theology. Thus, in order to truly do theology a theologian must be in a loving relationship with God.

To some, the belief that one must be in a loving relationship with God in order to know theological truths might seem to border on subjectivism. After all, revelation, it seems, is supposed to be objective. That is, it is supposed to be true apart from the state of the person knowing. Does this Torrancean account of theological knowledge lend itself towards subjectivism? Carl F.H. Henry, in *Revelation and Authority*, seemed to think it did. Henry writes, 'If a person must first be a Christian believer in order to grasp the truth of revelation, then meaning is subjective and incommunicable.'[44] Henry's concern with Torrance's theological epistemology is understandable. After all, Henry was seeking to 'establish the foundation of an apologetic theology.'[45] Henry was attempting to engage in public theology, which could be accepted or rejected as true or false regardless of whether or not the person who is presented with that theology is a Christian. Thus, if theology carried the precondition of union with Christ, it could not in principle, be accepted or rejected by all. Habets summarizes Henry's position well when he explains that, 'according to Henry, truth and statements of truth correspond such that

44 C. Henry, *Revelation and Authority*, vol. 3 (Waco: Word, 1979), p. 457.

45 Habets, *Theology in Transposition*, p. 96.

the truth is objectively known despite the condition—fallen or otherwise, Christian or not—of the subject.'[46] However, Henry's criticism that Torrance's theological epistemology leads to subjectivism is wrongheaded. Torrance believes that theological knowledge is indeed objective. This is because, Torrance believed that theology that accepts the 'primacy of its proper object of inquiry can be considered rational and scientific—hence objective.'[47] Theology reflection is governed by its object of inquiry, God, thus it is not subjective. Even though Henry misreads Torrance, Henry has brought up an important point regarding Torrance's theological epistemology; namely that, a consequence of Torrance's theological epistemology is a diminished role for apologetical theology. Those who believe that human reason 'is capable of intellectually analyzing rational evidence for the truth-value of assertions about God,' and thus elevate the role of apologetical theology, will find this consequence unacceptable.[48] However, those who believe that there is a deficiency in human reason that prevents humanity from knowing God apart from the gift of faith, and thus find little value in apologetics for conversion, will not find this an untoward consequence.

A second implication of Torrance's theological epistemology is that repentance will be crucial to the theological task. Although we know that objectively alienation and estrangement have been removed through Christ's atoning work, and that true reconciliation has occurred in the person and work of Christ, alienation and estrangement towards God can exist subjectively in the mind of a believer.[49] Acts of repentance (turning to God, confessing one's sins, accepting and believing that God's loving act of atonement has covered one's sin) can help remove that subjective alienation and estrangement that can exist in the mind of a believer.

A third implication of Torrance's theological epistemology is that a theologian must carry out her work in the context of Christian community, for the Holy Spirit carries out his work of making believers more loving especially within the context of a Christian community. It is within the context of Christian community, especially community centred upon hearing the word of God and the receiving of the Eucharist, that our love and affections become directed towards Christ, and in turn our very being is shaped in a Christ-like manner. Thus, it is especially within the

46 Ibid., p. 100.

47 Ibid., p. 101.

48 C. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, vol. 1 (Waco: Word, 1976), pp. 226–7.

49 A believer can 'know' the facts of gospel and even believe that it is true, yet at the same time not live as though the gospel were true.

Church that we become people who love God, i.e. the type of people who can 'know God in a godly way,' and in turn speak of God in a godly way.[50]

5. CONCLUSION

We began by noting two principles within Torrance's theological epistemology. We have seen how love may play a role in both of these principles. As the reader can probably tell, the title of this paper is inspired by Anselm's maxim '*Credo ut Intelligam*.' Anselm's statement implies that an understanding of Christian doctrine is impossible without faith or belief. This essay has suggested something similar; knowledge of God is impossible without love. This thesis is in line with most traditional theology that has stressed the need for spiritual discipline in the mind and life to truly know God.[51] If we take seriously the implications of Torrance's epistemology, that love plays a major role theological epistemology there can be no such thing as merely 'cold, rationalistic, academic' theology. Theology will always be an act performed in light of God's love for us and our love for him. In other words, taking Torrance's theological epistemology seriously means that we need to love God so that we may understand him.[52]

---

[50] In addition to the role that preaching and the sacraments might play in making us loving people who can know God in a loving way, something might also be said about the role that community may also play in shaping us into people who love God. It is often through the love of others that we experience God's love for us. It is often through the challenge of dealing with difficult people that our eyes are opened as to how God unconditionally loves us.

[51] One can think of many great theologians in the history of the church who are also exemplars of deep faith and love for God, for instance Augustine, Anslem, Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Jonathan Edwards. Some contemporary theologians have also made a similar point. Consider John Webster who explains that, 'Good Christian theology can only happen if it is rooted in the reconciliation of reason by the sanctifying presence of God.' J. Webster, *Holiness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), p. 10.

[52] I would like to thank Fuller Theological Seminary's Analytic Theology for Theological Formation team (Oliver Crisp, James Arcadi, J.T. Turner, Jordan Wessling, and Jesse Gentile) and Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen for helpful feedback on this essay.

Reviews

Geloofszekerheid. By Herman Bavinck and Henk Van Den Belt. Soesterberg: Aspekt, 2016. ISBN: 9789461535825. 324pp. £36.02.

Those unfamiliar with either Dutch or the writings of Herman Bavinck (1854–1921) may have missed the release of this important piece of scholarship from Henk Van Den Belt. *Geloofszekerheid* will, nevertheless, prove of interest to Anglophones who hold an interest in the theological questions surrounding the assurance of faith and have some secondary access to the language.

This volume brings together a range of shorter works in which Bavinck addresses the question of the assurance of faith. Included are the original and revised editions of *De Zekerheid des Geloofs*, (a work which may be familiar to English speakers through the translation by Harry der Nederlanden, *The Certainty of Faith* (St. Catherines, Ontario: Paideia Press, 1980), the original and revised versions of a lecture which to date has remained unpublished, a further article on the subject that Bavinck had written for the newspaper *De Bazuin*, and a Dutch translation of Benjamin B. Warfield's review of the original edition of *De Zekerheid des Geloofs* for the Princeton Theological Review. The volume concludes with a forty page essay in which Van Den Belt evaluates Bavinck's doctrine of assurance and demonstrates the way in which it seeks a middle path between rationalism and pietism.

Readers will be grateful for Van Den Belt's sensitive modernization of the nineteenth century spelling and grammar of the original texts, for the insightful guidance offered in the introductions to each text, the extensive background information provided in the footnotes, and for the various reproductions and photographs, especially the one of Bavinck at a dinner party steadfastly refusing to look at the camera. However, the particular value of *Geloofszekerheid* lies in its collocation of diverse material, which allows the reader to trace the development of Bavinck's thought. Van Den Belt is to be commended for the way he locates the development of Bavinck's thought within the context of the ecclesiastical tradition of the *Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerk*. In this regard, Van Den Belt's treatment of the related question of *wereldmijding*, or 'flight from the world', is illuminating. Van Den Belt notes that while Bavinck's criticism of this tendency is a constant in his writings, Bavinck's later writings reveal a change of tone. For example, by 1901 Bavinck could also write, 'Terwijl de christenen in vroeger dagen om zichzelf de wereld vergaten, lopen wij gevar in de wereld onszelf te verliezen.' [Although Christians in earlier

times neglected the world around them, we run the risk of losing ourselves in the world.] (p. 96) These statements and others like them reveal an increasing caution regarding the Neo-Calvinist emphasis on cultural engagement, as typified in a striking warning Bavinck issued at the Gereformeerd Studenten Congres of 1918, 'Maar één ding hadden deze mensen op ons voor: die wisten nog wat zonde en genade was. En lopen wij wel eens niet het gevaar, dat wij, bij al onze toegenomen kennis en cultureel inzicht, dat ene gaan vergeten?' [One thing these people had on us: they still knew what sin and grace was. Do we not at all run the risk, that we, with all our increased knowledge and cultural insight, will forget that one thing?] (p. 256).

The concluding essay is also a particularly helpful aide for readers who may be unfamiliar with either the seventeenth century or the nineteenth century background to the question of the certainty of faith. Van Den Belt adroitly offers Bavinck's position in summary, namely, that one might distinguish yet not separate the reflex act of faith from the act of faith itself, that the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit is intimately connected with the believer's identity as a child of God (Gal. 4:6), yet has no material content of its own. If one were to ask for a little more, it would be for an analysis of the relationship between the certainty of the object of faith and the certainty of the reflex act of faith in the light of Bavinck's account of self-consciousness. In *The Philosophy of Revelation* Bavinck points out that it is through self-consciousness that a consciousness of an external world is given. Whether this stands in tension with the relationship Bavinck posits between the certainty of faith's object and the certainty of the reflex act of faith is a question worth pondering.

All in all, Van Den Belt is to be praised for furnishing the Dutch speaking world with an excellent resource not only for understanding Bavinck's approach to the doctrine of assurance, but also for understanding the contours of Bavinck's thought more broadly. Those without Dutch can hope that an English translation of this book is not too far away.

Bruce Pass, University of Edinburgh

Spirit Hermeneutics: Reading Scripture in Light of Pentecost. By Craig S. Keener. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016. ISBN: 9780802874399. xxviii + 522pp. £39.99.

At the close of one of Professor David Fergusson's Gifford Lectures at the University of Glasgow in 2008, a challenge was laid at the door of the Pentecostal tradition to produce much more robust theology from its quarters. This book could indeed be a response to this challenge.

Keener's offering here is not a description of how Pentecostals do biblical hermeneutics; to do so would necessitate covering multiple divergent views. There is not one singular Pentecostal hermeneutic of scripture. What the author does provide instead is 'help articulat[ing] how the experience of the Spirit that empowered the church on the day of Pentecost can and should dynamically shape our reading of Scripture' (p. 4).

This can be accomplished by a two-fold process: (i) by the provision of a significant and sizeable critique of Keener's own tradition that has a reputation for, in extreme cases, being disinterested in the original message and context that scripture was received. Adding to this, the ravaging of the authoritative canon has on occasions taken place by preachers to purport their own agendas and ideas under the guise of the message being biblical. (ii) As a biblical scholar in a North American context, the author unsurprisingly purports that Pentecostals redress this imbalance by adopting a hermeneutic of historical-grammatical and historical-critical method. There is no way, the author insists, that Pentecostals can provide an interpretation of scripture for faith and life today without first grappling with and sourcing knowledge of what its first recipients understood by any given text. The majority of this book is dominated by the necessity to have this first move of interpretation fleshed out in order that the second move can legitimately be made.

Keener's explicitly inductive method is a forensic examination of historical background in order that 'Pentecostals, charismatics and other people of the Spirit may add to hermeneutical wisdom already in place' (p. 7). Instead, he wishes to champion an 'experiential reading' of the text. This book invokes Pentecost as an appropriate hermeneutic because 'the entire church must be experiential if it wishes to be biblical' (p. 11). Whether it be early or late patristics, Reformers or Puritans, Keener stresses that the saints have always relied on the Holy Spirit for understanding and meaning through diligent study and the reception and delivery of preaching.

The author rightly wishes to draw into the discussion the Global South where Pentecostalism and the Charismatic Church are exploding in growth. Whether it be Latin America, the African continent or Asia, what the Spirit is saying in and through those churches through biblical interpretation is crucial. Western Pentecostalism must incorporate what the Spirit is saying through the canonical text in the Global South in order for a Pentecostal reading of the text to have its full force. This portion of the book provides something quite novel for biblical hermeneutics. It was reminiscent of Kirsteen Kim's pneumatological missiology.

Whereas the author does not leave any stone unturned, one is left feeling that its content could have been covered in half the length. Neverthe-

less, this book is a very accessible read and clear in its meaning. Thinking about Keener's proposal in the wake of five hundred years since the start of the Reformation makes me wonder how feasible it is to implement other than by the scholarly pastor. Does one need to be an academic historian or a classicist to hear the Spirit in the text?

Stuart C. Weir, Scottish School of Christian Mission and Scottish Baptist College

Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels. By Richard B. Hays. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016. ISBN: 978-1-481-0491-7. xix + 504pp. £33.50.

Richard B. Hays's book, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1989), had a huge impact on the field of New Testament studies. The notion of 'intertextual echoes', along with Hays's seven 'tests' for detecting them, have played a significant (though not uncontested) role in biblical interpretation ever since.

Now Hays has produced a much larger volume that self-consciously builds on the earlier work (seen clearly in the parallel title and the similar cover art), this time considering the four canonical Gospels.

Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels appeared soon after the publication of a shorter volume dealing with much the same theme, entitled *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014). As Hays explains in his preface to the larger book, the material for the 2013-14 Hulsean Lectures (Cambridge), published as *Reading Backwards*, was in fact drawn from the draft manuscript of *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. So, if you have already read *Reading Backwards*, you will have been given a good taster of *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. If you have not yet read *Reading Backwards*, then you can afford to skip it and simply read the more fully developed work.

The book follows a consistent pattern. Following an introductory chapter that lays out the principles adopted in the book, there are four lengthy chapters on the four canonical Gospels: 'The Gospel of Mark: Herald of Mystery', 'The Gospel of Matthew: Torah Transfigured', 'The Gospel of Luke: The Liberation of Israel', and 'The Gospel of John: The Temple of His Body'.

Each chapter has five sections. These deal with the following issues (quoting Hays's bullet points on page 9):

- The Evangelist as interpreter of Israel's Scripture: overview
- How does the Evangelist invoke/evoke Scripture to re-narrate Israel's story?

- How does the Evangelist invoke/evoke Scripture to narrate the identity of Jesus?

- How does the Evangelist invoke/evoke Scripture to narrate the church's role in relation to the world?

- Summary conclusion: findings about the distinctive scriptural hermeneutics of the Evangelist.

Following the main chapters, Hays provides a brief conclusion. There are some seventy-four pages of end notes, some quite substantial, followed by a bibliography, an index of Scripture and other ancient texts, and an index of names. In the preface, Hays acknowledges significant help (particularly relating to the notes) from a number of academic colleagues as he worked to complete the manuscript during a period of serious illness.

In his introduction, Hays indicates his presupposition that 'all four canonical Gospels are deeply embedded in a symbolic world shaped by the Old Testament' (p. 10). In considering intertextual references, Hays employs the categories, familiar to many of his readers, of 'quotation', 'allusion', and 'echo'. At the heart of Hays's approach is the concept of 'metalepsis'. Hays explains (p. 11),

> Metalepsis is a literary technique of citing or echoing a small bit of a precursor text in such a way that the reader can grasp the significance of the echo only by recalling or recovering the original context from which the fragmentary echo came and then reading the two texts in dialogical juxtaposition. The figurative effect of such an intertextual linkage lies in the unstated or suppressed points of correspondence between the two texts.

In his conclusion, Hays states succinctly his notion of 'figural interpretation' (p. 359, italics are original):

> In short, *figural interpretation discerns a divinely crafted pattern of coherence within the events and characters of the biblical narratives.*

Reading *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* was a pleasure. Hays writes clearly and elegantly. The book is a rich collection of short studies of passages from the Gospels. Hays recognises that some of the cases he makes are stronger than others, but even where the reader may not always be convinced by Hays's argument, there is much to learn from his careful discussions of specific texts. Hebrew and Greek script is used both in the main text of the book and in the notes, but readers without Hebrew and

Greek should still be able to make sense of the discussion without much difficulty.

Combined with the detailed analysis of possible verbal correspondences in various texts, Hays offers a richly theological reading of the Gospels that will be of great benefit to preachers. In particular, he emphasises the high Christology that his studies suggest. For example, with reference to Matthew's Gospel, Hays writes (p. 175, italics are original),

> *Matthew highlights the worship of Jesus for one reason: he believes and proclaims that Jesus is the embodied presence of God and that to worship Jesus is to worship YHWH*—not merely an agent or a facsimile or an intermediary. If we read the story within the hermeneutical matrix of Israel's Scripture, we can draw no other conclusion.

Perhaps one of Hays's most significant legacies will be a renewed emphasis within academic biblical studies on the coherence and interconnectedness of Scripture. In his conclusion he urges readers to become immersed in the texts of the Old Testament as the Evangelists were (p. 357, italics are original),

> What would it mean to undertake the task of reading Scripture *along with* the Evangelists? First of all, it would mean cultivating a deep knowledge of the Old Testament texts, getting these texts into our blood and bones. It would mean learning the texts by heart in the fullest sense. The pervasive, complex, and multivalent uses of Scripture that we find in the Gospels could arrive only in and for a community immersed in scriptural language and imagery.... But, alas, many Christian communities have lost touch with the sort of deep primary knowledge of Scripture—especially Israel's Scripture—that would enable them even to perceive the messages conveyed by the Evangelists' biblical allusions and echoes, let alone to employ Scripture with comparable facility in their own preaching and renarration of the gospel story.

I hope many teachers, students and preachers will read this book, consider carefully its ideas, and so take up Hays's challenge to enable themselves and others to engage with the Old Testament (and the Gospels) more fully and effectively.

Alistair I. Wilson, Highland Theological College UHI

Intermediate Greek Grammar. By David L. Mathewson and Elodie Ballantine Emig. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016. ISBN: 978-0-8010-3072-7. xxiii + 307pp. £21.99.

Many preachers who learned New Testament Greek around the same time as I did (that is, during the early 1990s) or earlier will probably have been taught a number of ideas that have since been questioned, challenged, or simply abandoned in recent scholarship. While it is by no means inevitable that the most recent scholarship is always correct on every point (since *all* scholarship, even that which is quickly overturned, is 'the most recent scholarship' at some point!), it would be wise for those who work with the Greek text of Scripture to become acquainted with recent discussion. That can be a daunting task for preachers (and students), particularly when it comes to technical studies in linguistics.

Baker Academic, like several other publishers, have recently provided some very helpful resources to help beginning and intermediate students of Greek to engage constructively with the best recent scholarship. In 2014, Baker published Rodney Decker's introductory volume, *Reading Koine Greek*. This foundational grammar for beginning students is notable for taking account of recent advances in understanding of Greek and for providing more information than would typically be found in an introductory grammar. For readers who have studied Greek in the past but who now feel they have forgotten most of what they learned and would like to remedy the situation, Decker's book may be the best option. For those whose Greek is somewhat stronger, on the other hand, this new volume by Mathewson and Emig would be worth considering.

That this new volume is intended to be, in some sense, as a companion to Decker's work is clearly seen by the cover design, with the similar colour scheme and Greek characters. It is a much more slight volume than Decker's, however, and is in a smaller format. The apparent intention is, following Calvin, to combine brevity and clarity.

The two authors are colleagues at Denver Seminary. They demonstrate expertise in current discussion of the language, taking account of recent and reliable scholarly work on Greek grammar (on, for example the middle voice and 'deponency'). In general, Mathewson and Emig take what they describe in the introduction as a 'minimalistic' approach to grammar (p. xix). They argue that many of the nuances of meaning in a particular passage of Greek come not from the grammatical forms employed but from the context, namely, the particular words that are used and their relationships to one another.

In addition to the short introduction, the book is composed of thirteen chapters dealing with various standard topics such as 'the cases'; 'the arti-

cle' (N.B., *not* the 'definite article'!); and 'prepositions'. The chapters are generally opened with a brief orientation to the topic, followed by more specific sections on sub-topics. Thus, for example, the chapter on cases provides two pages of introductory comment followed by sections that consider the nominative case, the vocative case, and so on. Within each of these sections, examples of usage are provided from the Greek New Testament, along with a translation into English. The particular feature under consideration is highlighted with bold type. Some examples are considered self-evident and are left to speak for themselves. Others have a comment (generally brief, though sometimes substantial) added underneath to draw the reader's attention to the key points. Typical of recent studies, there is also a chapter on 'the Greek verb system', in which the authors introduce the concept of 'aspect'. Another chapter that reflects more recent scholarship deals with 'discourse considerations'. This final chapter draws together a number of features highlighted in earlier chapters to show how the elements of a unit of text relate to each other to communicate the intention of the author. At various points throughout the book (often, but not only, at the end of chapters), there are 'For Practice' sections which generally provide a paragraph of Greek text for the student to work on. No annotations or vocabulary are provided for these and so students must make use of other reference tools to carry out the work.

Mathewson and Emig indicate in their introductory remarks that they became aware of the broadly similar project by Köstenberger, Merkle and Plummer, which was published as *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek* (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2016). That both teams of authors pursued their projects to completion so that the two books were published within a few months of each other should be regarded as a double blessing for students of New Testament Greek. Both volumes are excellent in terms of the quality of the scholarship that they present (although, unsurprisingly, they approach certain topics in somewhat different ways) and in terms of their suitability for intermediate students. There is very little to choose between them and the ideal for any keen Greek student will be to possess both volumes! If a choice has to be made, then perhaps those who require more help to revive or develop their Greek will find the more expansive text by Köstenberger, Merkle and Plummer helpful, while those who feel more confident in their Greek knowledge will find Mathewson and Emig more concise and crisp in their discussions.

Mathewson and Emig have written a clear, well-informed guide to New Testament Greek Grammar that should prove helpful to intermediate students in a classroom setting and to those who wish to update

and improve their knowledge of Greek. There is no longer any excuse for reproducing outdated interpretations of Greek!

Alistair I. Wilson, Highland Theological College UHI

Scottish Federalism and Covenantalism in Transition: The Theology of Ebenezer Erskine. By Stephen G. Myers. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2015. ISBN: 9781556355356. xxi +257pp. £24.

In the growing body of literature on the history of Reformed covenant theology, many works fall into the rut of being simply descriptive. They often limit their arguments to summaries of older works, rather than providing deep analysis and historical context. Thankfully, Stephen G. Myers's work on the federal and covenantal theology of Ebenezer Erskine (1680-1754) not only avoids this rut entirely, but provides us with insights from Erskine's thought that helps us understand eighteenth century Scottish theology, as well as a much clearer and deeper understanding of the '*Marrow* controversy.'

Chapter one sets the stage with an account of Erskine's life, and the political and ecclesiastical controversies that occurred early in his ministry. In Erskine's time, the Scottish church largely held to John Knox's view that the church and state were both to work together to bring about godly reform. In the Union of 1707, it was proposed that the established church of Scotland join with the established church of England. Upon this union, more controversy developed over the freedom clergy would have in both nations to worship according to their consciences. In this 'Abjuration Oath Controversy,' Erskine took the 'non-juror' position that this oath would require the minister to swear allegiance not only to the monarch of England, but also to the bishops he appointed. His role in these controversies made Erskine an influential figure who would later play an important role in the *Marrow* controversy.

Chapter two examines the issues that were involved in the *Marrow* controversy. This controversy centred on the republication of Edward Fisher's *The Marrow of Modern Divinity in Scotland*. The accusations made in this controversy were that those who supported the book were antinomian, and those who opposed it were legalists. Myers digs deeply into the issues of this controversy and highlights how the disputes were caused by very different conceptions of how the law relates to the covenant of works, if there is an intra-Trinitarian covenant of redemption, and the conditionality of the covenant of grace. James Hadow, who opposed the *Marrow*, held that grace in the covenant was 'mediate,' meaning salvation came by grace, but this grace 'was given through the means of the elect's divinely-enabled obedience to the Gospel Commands.' (pp. 66-67)

Erskine, in contrast held that salvation was 'immediate,' meaning it 'was given as a gift.' (p. 66) This look into differing strands of covenant theology involved in the *Marrow* controversy is an incredibly helpful contribution to our understanding of debates over the nature of antinomianism. This chapter focuses on the transition in 'federalism,' or covenant theology, in the Scottish church, and the differences between Erskine and Hadow are significant enough to cause divergence about the nature of the gospel. As Erskine stood with those who supported the *Marrow*, he became increasingly excluded within the church.

Chapter three looks at the transitions in Scottish 'covenantalism,' or the concept that the Scottish state had covenantal responsibility to God. Erskine transitioned to a new pulpit in Stirling, but was hesitantly received by the presbytery because of his reputation in connection to the *Marrow* controversy. He preached against the idea of ministers being appointed by secular patrons, and he was censured because of this sermon. Growing disputes about the link between church and politics, combined with being excluded from the established church by censure, led to Erskine and a few other members separating from the established church to form the Associate Presbytery. This was known as the Secession Crisis. Yet, although his situation greatly changed throughout these events, Erskine seems to have maintained a stable theology.

The last chapter traces Erskine's ministry into the 1740s, and records how his federalism and covenantalism play out in the context of separation from the established church. The key event here is the opposition of the new Associate Presbytery to the evangelistic work of George Whitefield in Scotland. Erskine's Associate Presbytery requested Whitefield come to preach in Scotland, which reveals that they had no theological qualms that prevented working with him. Yet, when Whitefield would not refuse to work with churches of the established church, the Associate Presbytery turned to vocal opposition of Whitefield. Erskine's view that the established church had violated its covenantal responsibility to God led him to be hostile to those who would work with that church.

Myers' book on Ebenezer Erskine is an important contribution to our understanding of Scottish Christianity in the eighteenth century. It will be useful for historians looking at the political tensions between church and state relations, but will also be helpful for theologians and ministers who want to understand the theological debates that drive disputes over antinomianism and legalism.

Harrison Perkins, Queen's University Belfast

God's Ambassadors: The Westminster Assembly and the Reformation of the English Pulpit, 1643-1653. By Chad Van Dixhoorn. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2017. ISBN: 9781601785343. xxvi + 215pp. £33.50.

In the last decade, there has been a growing interest in the Westminster Assembly. The gathering met primarily during the English civil war, and has been most known for producing the Westminster Confession of Faith, as well as the Westminster Larger and Shorter Catechisms. These documents are still used around the world as constitutional documents for many denominations, although predominantly Presbyterians. There is, however, growing interest not only in the documents the Assembly released, but the activities the Assembly conducted as well. Chad Van Dixhoorn gives us a good analysis of the ways in which the Assembly members worked to overturn the state of pulpit ministry in the Church of England and install ministers whom they found to be faithful in holiness of life and quality of preaching.

An increasing number of scholars argue that religion played a key role in causing the English civil war. Van Dixhoorn picks up that line of scholarship and argues that religious factors were not only an ideological concern for clergy in England, but they also had imminently practical concerns as well. The scope of this book covers what actions the Assembly members took because they were 'obsessed with pulpit reform.' (p. xv) Although not part of the initial charge in calling the Assembly, a committee was formed to examine ministerial candidates, and this committee was active for the entire life of the Assembly. The body of this volume explains the background and theory behind the activities of this committee.

Part one and two focus on more traditionally historical matters. Part one gives contextual information about the Assembly, its calling and its relationship to Parliament. This is an incredibly helpful treatment of the troubles the Assembly faced, and explains how they often sought after results for which Parliament cared little. Conflict that 'godly' ministers and theologians had with Archbishop William Laud and his anti-Calvinistic impositions on the church were very much in focus. The Assembly was very much concerned to see the ministers of the Laudian persuasion replaced with ministers of the Reformed persuasion. Part two explores the debates and conclusions of the committee for examining ministers. This fascinating section of the book discusses the disagreements that took place about what the task of the minister really was to be and what qualified candidates for that task. There was an apparent suspicion of candidates because the Assembly members did not always trust their references

that testified to their holiness of life. The Assembly examined the candidate for character and also for ability. Learning was an important factor for the committee and they insisted that ministers be of a certain intellectual calibre. As informative as Van Dixhoorn's discussion is here for understanding seventeenth century concerns, it also gives us significant insight into why some modern denominations still insist so thoroughly on an educated clergy and rigorous vetting of ministerial candidates.

Whereas parts one and two discuss historical factors and debates that shaped the life of the Assembly's committee to examine ministers, part three looks into why they thought this was an important exercise at all. All the Assembly members thought preaching was of the utmost importance for the church. The designation 'ambassador' has particular significance (p. 116). Preachers were in fact sent by God to deliver his Word, going so far as to say, 'preaching of the Word of God is in a very real and proper sense the Word of God.' (p. 125) In this way, preaching is a true means of grace, or, a real encounter with the grace of God. The Assemblymen considered preaching to be the primary way that God used to bring people to salvation (p. 126). The emphasis of the Assembly on preaching was shaped by the conflicts with Laudianism in the 1630s. The Laudians had emphasized the sacraments as more important than the preached Word, and had put them in competition. The Assembly, by contrast, emphasized the preached Word as primary because 'the preached Word could be used for both the conversion and the strengthening of the Christian, the sacraments only for the latter.' (p. 130) The rest of the book explores the theory that undergirded the convictions held by the Assembly.

Van Dixhoorn's book is a very helpful examination of the concerns that drove the Westminster Assembly to change things not only at the confessional level of the church, but in the pulpits themselves. In contrast to Ireland, where Protestants attempted to enforce Reformation by imposition, this English synod worked to reform from the ground up. Instead of hoping that the confessional position trickled down into pulpits and then to people, they put confessional ministers directly into churches. Part of this, of course, has to do with greater resources available in England compared to Ireland, but it also demonstrates how thorough the concern was at the Westminster Assembly to reform the English pulpit.

Harrison Perkins, Queen's University Belfast

All that is in God: Evangelical Theology and the Challenge of Classical Theism. By James E. Dolezal. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2017. ISBN: 9781601785541. 176pp. £15.99.

If you're looking for a readable, short, and well-written primer in the classical doctrine of God then this book will do the trick. In six chapters and a conclusion and at around 150 pages, this would be a good book for an intermediate class in systematic theology or the doctrine of God. It deals with some standard worries about the classical position, such as issues raised with divine simplicity in recent times by the likes of Alvin Plantinga. But it doesn't deal with *all* the difficulties (this is, after all, a primer).

For instance, in response to Ryan Mullins's worries that divine simplicity entails the denial of any real distinctions in the Godhead, though the divine persons are said to be relations that are real, the author simply asserts that divine simplicity doesn't deny real distinctions in God, only those distinctions that would imply composition. The reader is left to ponder how any distinction can fail to imply composition in God if it is a *real* distinction. Similarly, in responding to alternatives to the classical view of the Trinity, the author takes on what he calls 'theistic mutualism,' (what is more often called, 'theistic personalism,' the idea that God is just a very big person with distinct properties and states). But he doesn't mention the recent penchant for relative identity and compositional accounts of the Godhead, which are (to my way of thinking) the most promising alternatives to the classical 'Latin' versions of the Trinity discussed today.

A more methodological worry has to do with the motivation for the classical view. The author seems to think that it should be upheld because it is traditional. Theological tradition is often a good thing, of course. However, an appeal to tradition is surely an insufficient reason for holding a view. One surely needs some principled reason for holding to the classical theistic picture other than the claim that it is traditional. (For instance, there is a tradition of Arianism. But appealing to the tradition of Arianism is insufficient as a reason for holding that Arianism is orthodox.) The author may think that his appeal to a great cloud of witnesses going back to Irenaeus, and to a number of creeds and confessions, makes good on his claims about classical theism as traditional *and* orthodox. But it is not clear to me that the tradition speaks with one voice on these matters. And it is not clear to me that theistic personalists are not able to claim their own views are in conformity to the catholic creeds and (at least some) confessions of the particular traditions to which they belong.

Two other related points are worth mentioning in this connection. First, the author does a commendable job of showing how many of the ideas he sets forth can be rooted in Scripture, understood from a cer-

tain point of view. However, sometimes he seems a little too confident about what can be gleaned from Scripture on convoluted issues about the doctrine of God. It seems to me that Scripture is metaphysically underdetermined on matters like divine simplicity, or divine immutability, which is one important reason why there are such interminable theological debates about these matters. Second, the author seems to assume that the philosophy of Aristotle is the obvious choice for classical theists. But that is not at all obvious. Suppose the theologian thinks that there are significant drawbacks with notions like 'substantial form,' and holds to a different ontology from the Aristotelians. There are a number of such thinkers today, many of whom are theistic personalists. Is there no way to be orthodox in one's theology unless one is an Aristotelian? That is surely a step too far. Surely, no one—the author of this little volume included—wants to reify a particular (pagan) philosophy as the only way to rightly understand Christian theology? However, at times he writes as if Aristotle is the obvious choice—perhaps the default choice—for classical theists. And that is likely to be a stumbling block for at least some readers able to discern the philosophy behind the theology.

Those with serious worries about divine simplicity and how it 'fits' with the Trinity may not find the answers they are looking for in this book. But those who want to get a sense of why so many today continue to find in classical theism a broadly coherent picture of the divine nature will find here a good place to start. I certainly read this work with profit and will be recommending it to students.

Oliver D. Crisp, Fuller Theological Seminary and the University of St Andrews

Death in Adam, Life in Christ: The Doctrine of Imputation. By J. V. Fesko. Reformed, Exegetical and Doctrinal Studies. Fearn: Christian Focus, 2016. ISBN: 978-1-78191-908-8. 332pp. £12.99.

The choice of the doctrine of imputation for this first study in the new R.E.D.S. (Reformed, Exegetical and Doctrinal Studies) series reflects the author's conviction that imputation is 'of vital importance for a right and robust understanding of the doctrine of justification and ultimately the gospel.' (p. 275)

Fesko is also joint series editor. The series preface promises new studies 'informed by rigorous exegetical attention to the biblical text, engagement with the history of doctrine, with a goal of refined dogmatic formulation', alongside 'warm, pastoral application' (p. 11).

This first volume follows the recipe well, and is a promising start to the series.

Structurally, the book consists of three parts: I: History of the Doctrine; II: Exegesis; and III: Dogmatic Formulation. These are bounded by a general introduction and conclusion, but the reader is also helped by introductions and conclusions to each chapter, as well as separate 'summaries' appended to each part. The summaries are particularly useful as Fesko builds his argument and deals with alternative views and objections. His first summary in Part I is in the form of a series of twelve 'issues' (questions) raised by his historical study, to which he then offers answers on the basis of his exegetical and dogmatic conclusions at the end of Parts II and III. This structure gives the whole book a sense of direction and coherence.

Fesko's stated intention is to defend 'the thesis that the doctrine of immediate threefold imputation (Adam's guilt to all human beings, the sins of the elect to Christ, and Christ's active and passive obedience to the elect) is a biblical doctrine' (p. 22).

In Part I, Fesko explains that it was in fact the Roman Catholic theologians Catharinus and Layñez who first taught the ideas of an Adamic covenant and covenantally imputed original guilt (p. 50; pp. 73-74), although these ideas were picked up and developed by many in the Reformed tradition, following the magisterial Reformers.

Fesko's survey of the post-Reformation period includes analysis of the controversies surrounding the views of Johannes Piscator and Josua Placaeus, and the responses of Beza, Rollock, and Roberts, among others. Notable in this section is Fesko's discovery of a 'crucial piece of grammar' (a comma!) in the original of WCF which was removed from later editions of the confession: the comma seems to indicate that chapter XI of the confession contains a clear reference to both the passive and the active righteousness of Christ (p. 95).

Fesko's basic thesis will be familiar to many Reformed readers, perhaps from such works as John Murray's *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (Presbyterian & Reformed, 1977). But, Fesko parts with Murray in his insistence that imputation must be understood in the context of a twofold covenantal structure which, he says, 'clothes the doctrine in the robe of the blood, sweat, and tears of redemptive history' (p. 22).

Indeed, it is a covenantal structure which Fesko argues in Part II is the basis for several examples of 'the individual-corporate dynamic' in scripture, including Achan's sin, David's census, and Daniel's Son of Man (pp. 177-81). In each case, the covenant binds the one to the many, so that the actions of the one are imputed to the many. Close analysis of other 'imputation texts' in the Old Testament (pp. 181-93) amounts to a convincing demonstration that the concept of imputation is not limited to the Pauline epistles.

When Fesko turns to the New Testament, he gives close attention to Romans 4, Romans 5:12-21, and 2 Corinthians 5:17-21, arguing that these texts must be interpreted with the Old Testament background in mind.

The final, doctrinal, section is lucid and persuasive, exhibiting the influence of Meredith Kline on its biblical theology, but going beyond Kline (on a nevertheless thoroughly Klinean trajectory) in a fascinating and original section on the role of the Holy Spirit in imputation (pp. 261-63).

According to Fesko, Adam must be an historical person. Fesko does not offer an extended case for Adam's historicity, but he demonstrates (in response to Barth, Enns *et al*) that the historicity of Adam is a 'pillar' of the doctrine of imputation: move it, 'and the doctrinal edifice comes crashing down' (p. 235).

Fesko interacts with contrary views both past and present throughout the book, including, most recently, Oliver Crisp (pp. 266-69). His omission of any representatives of the Federal Vision, while briefly explained in the preface (p. 15) is nevertheless to be regretted, in this reviewer's opinion.

Fesko's concluding section on the pastoral value of the doctrine of imputation is useful and heartening, and it comes across with all the more force given the depth and breadth of the foundations laid throughout the book. This is an impressive and comprehensive treatment, and deserves a wide readership.

Richard Brash, University of Edinburgh

Philip Doddridge and the Shaping of Evangelical Dissent. By Robert Strivens. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015. ISBN: 978-1-4724-4075-4. 196pp. £65.

Readers eager to know more about the renowned Philip Doddridge (1702-51), pastor of Castle Hill Church, Northampton and tutor in a notable Dissenting Academy associated with it have not been particularly well served in recent decades. After a series of publications regarding Doddridge emerging from the researches of Geoffrey Nuttall between 1950 and the late 1970's, there was only—until very recent times—the biography of Doddridge by Malcolm Deacon (1980) added to the store. The dearth of attention would appear to have been part of a general decline in the study of Nonconformity in the eighteenth century—a tendency perhaps reflective of a decline in the vitality of this once-formidable movement. Since the passing of Nuttall in 2007, there have only been the several insightful studies of Alan Sell to shed light on eighteenth century Nonconformity's significance for theology and church history.

Yet this review has begun with the qualifier, 'until very recent times'. Strivens's fresh investigations, which are reflective of his doctoral research carried out through the University of Stirling, can be seen to be part of a renaissance of investigation of Doddridge and eighteenth century Nonconformity unfolding across the last decade. On the one hand, there is the collaborative arrangement now existing between Dr. Williams's Library Centre for Dissenting Studies and the Queen Mary University Centre for Religion and Literature in English with which is associated the work of Prof. Isabel Rivers. This collaboration has already produced several important volumes with the all-important volume *A History of the Dissenting Academies in the British Isles* soon to be released. Strivens, while working independently of this consortium, shows himself to have been abreast of this scholarship and conversant with the resources at Dr. Williams's Library. On the other hand, there does seem to be some recent stirring among historians of Nonconformity as reflected in the recent volume edited by Robert Pope, the *T&T Clark Companion to Nonconformity* (2016).

Strivens's approach to his subject can be categorized as one of reassessment. As he makes clear in an illuminating introductory section (pp. 1-19), Doddridge and his legacy are contested. His interpreters have been divided between those who have construed Doddridge as standing largely in continuity with the preceding Puritan Nonconformity which endured the 'Great Ejection' of 1662. and those who have seen in the Northampton tutor the harbinger of the eventual theological latitude which more and more characterized Nonconformity in the nineteenth century. While Strivens's loyalties are with the first group, the methodology he employs in reaching a fresh assessment often requires him to take a revisionist stance as and when the evidence calls the conventional wisdom into question.

As the subsequent chapters make plain, Doddridge was (chap. I) a great admirer of Richard Baxter (1615-1691) whose practical works he especially treasured. Yet in matters theological, his position was more akin to that of the 'moderate Calvinist', John Howe (1630-1705). This position stood in closer continuity with the earlier Reformed position, yet *without* any predilection for the use of confessions of faith or creeds. Doddridge could also be on friendly terms with confessional Calvinists such as Thomas Ridgley (1667-1734) without occupying strictly identical ground. Doddridge's position was also carefully staked out so as to safeguard against the high Calvinist error of antinomianism.

Though Congregational Independents such as Doddridge had a confessional legacy to draw on from the preceding century (i.e. the Savoy Confession of 1658), the Northampton tutor espoused the belief

(chap. II) that everything important to be believed for salvation was evident in Scripture. Strict creedal subscription might drive apart persons who—agreed on the heart of things—might differ over the articulation. As regards the doctrine of the Trinity, Doddridge's position cannot be described as robust; as to the divine Sonship, he was content to navigate between the twin heresies of Socinianism and Arianism.

A reader will not be surprised to learn that Doddridge (along with other tutors in the Dissenting Academies) interacted with John Locke (1632-1704). His volume, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), soon challenged older, more Aristotelian works for a place in the academy curriculum (chaps. III-IV). While Doddridge and other Nonconformist tutors welcomed the new and refreshing emphasis represented by Locke, they were at the same time alert to the limitations of Locke's approach as it impinged upon theological questions. Locke's approach was so dependent on empirical observation and so wedded to the employment of reason in weighing what was believable that it did not sufficiently safeguard the reality of things known only by revelation. Doddridge, like Isaac Watts before him, insisted that the soul of man is to be accepted as eternal on biblical grounds—even though empirical observation cannot buttress this confidence.

Doddridge both in voice and in print was accustomed to extol the importance of proclamation; he was insistent that Christian prose (spoken or written) should be characterized by simplicity and plainness—while eschewing things coarse. He wanted his young charges to find acceptance in polite society while focusing above all on clarity in gospel communication (chap. V). Yet Strivens feels bound to acknowledge that Doddridge both as a very young man, and subsequently, often fell below his own articulated standard. His sermons and practical writings were quite capable of displaying artifice and literary flourish—even when the author conceived of a purer ideal.

Doddridge both by his own devotional habits and by his practical writings inculcated a quite intense devotional ideal entailing private adoration of God, meditation on Scripture and sung praise (chap. VI). He was just as keen that there be devotional exercises for the entire household; one of his most popular publications, the *Family and Closet Expositor* (commencing 1739) was intended to supply help for thoughtful family Bible readings. In this respect, Strivens shows that Doddridge's ideals were essentially those of his Puritan forbears.

Examined last of all is the question of what may be inferred about Doddridge's eventual legacy (given his short life) by the circle of friendships he maintained. (chap. VII). Here, Strivens is at pains to point out that Doddridge kept at arm's length persons of speculative theological

views, preferring instead the intimate friendship of those who, like himself, were moderate in their Calvinism as well as those whose orthodoxy was measured by their confessional loyalty. It is here that Strivens comes closest to opening up the question on which the inquisitive reader will be seeking guidance: what of Doddridge's legacy given the relative fragility of the moderating theological position he chose to maintain?

This question, alas, lies beyond the scope of Strivens's most helpful reassessment. It is to be hoped that on the basis of the even-handedness demonstrated in this work, we may expect a second Doddridge volume from this author. When one realizes that Doddridge's *Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics and Divinity*—both in contemporary hand-copied manuscripts and (after 1763) in eventual print format—became a principal resource in Nonconformist academies (whether Presbyterian, Baptist, or Independent) across the land, one senses that there is a further story to be told about the legacy (for good or ill) of this Northampton tutor.

Kenneth J. Stewart, Covenant College, USA

The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800. Edited by Ulrich L. Lehner, Richard A. Muller and A. G. Roeber. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. ISBN: 978-0-19-993794-3. xv + 668pp. £112.50.

In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology*, Ulrich Lehner, Richard Muller and A. G. Roeber have brought together forty-three scholars to offer an invaluable and wide-ranging overview of theology in the period from (loosely) 1600–1800. This volume contains forty-two essays that introduce readers to a variety of issues in early modern theology, ranging from studies of key theological concepts, such as predestination and providence, through to discussions of the interaction between theology and philosophy.

The volume is divided into three parts. Part I contains three essays that set the context for the rest of the volume. Ronnie Po-chia Hsia's essay examines the developments in Protestant and Catholic missions from 1500–1800, and serves as a valuable reminder that discussions about early modern theology cannot neglect a global perspective. Ulrich Leinsle's chapter introduces readers to the various sources, methods and forms for early modern theology, observing that the latter two were often linked. Paul Shore examines the development of the confessional state noting the importance of the 'interplay of secular and religious forces.' (p. 54)

Part II contains twenty-six essays that constitute the heart of the volume. The first twenty of these essays explore specific aspects of Cath-

olic, Reformed, and Lutheran theologies, while the remaining six offer overviews of Anabaptist, Arminian, Jansenist, Moravian, Pietist, and Socinian theologies. Through these contributions, readers are introduced to the key theological debates in the early modern period, its leading cast of theologians, and the current state of scholarly research.

It is worth mentioning two chapters from this section by way of illustration. Jean-Louis Quantin's essay on 'Catholic Moral Theology, 1550–1800' offers an insightful glimpse into the competing approaches to determining issues of morality within early modern Catholicism. Quantin traces the rise and fall of probabilism as a key form of Catholic moral theology. Probabilism allowed individuals to act against their own conscience if they thought that the opinion of another was more probable. Quantin shows how it grew out of Catholic casuistry, but ultimately fell from favour after it was criticised by the Rigorists, who accorded more weight to Scripture and the church fathers. Quantin's essay skilfully guides the reader through the key debates in this nuanced area of early modern Catholic theology. Crawford Gribben's essay on 'Early Modern Reformed Eschatology' is a similarly fine example of how a potentially complicated area of theology is introduced clearly and concisely in this volume. Gribben plots the development of Reformed eschatology, showing how it was initially defined in opposition to Catholic beliefs about purgatory and Anabaptist ideas about the millennium, but that 'millennial theory... became almost creedal' (p. 267) in seventeenth-century England. Gribben observes 'a cooling of eschatological hopes' (p. 268) after the Thirty Years' War, but notes that the eighteenth-century revivals helped to drive eschatological interest again. The fact that contributors are able to explore the development of theological ideas over two centuries, or more, in their essays is certainly one of the strengths of the volume.

The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology is arguably at its strongest though, when the chapters facilitate some degree of comparison between the different theological confessions. For example, Marius Reiser, Carl Trueman, and Benjamin Mayes each contributed a chapter on scripture and exegesis (in Catholic, Reformed and Lutheran theologies respectively). Since these chapters cover similar ground, it is possible for the reader to consider the similarities and differences between these traditions. That being said, not every topic receives such equal treatment across confessional lines. While the Catholic and Lutheran views on the sacraments are the subjects of dedicated chapters, the Reformed position is simply incorporated into a broader chapter on 'Church and Church/State Relations in the Post-Reformation Reformed Tradition'. Ian Hazlett's discussion of the sacraments in this chapter offers a helpful overview, but

a more comprehensive examination of their place in Reformed thought would have been beneficial for readers.

Part III contains thirteen chapters focusing on the interplay between early modern western theologies and other religions, churches, and philosophies. Stephen Burnett's chapter on 'Western Theologies and Judaism in the Early Modern World' underscores the confessional dynamics at play in this period, by noting that the authors of anti-Jewish polemical works were 'shaped by the need to establish clear theological boundaries between themselves and other confessional churches, schismatics, anti-Trinitarians, and atheists, as well as with Judaism.' (p. 474) Both Burnett's chapter and Emanuele Colombo's contribution on 'Western Theologies and Islam in the Early Modern World' also note the increase in language learning during this period, as Christians sought to enhance their understanding of Judaism and Islam, and to refute their opponents, by mastering Hebrew and Arabic. Other chapters in this section also consider the interaction of philosophers, such as Descartes, Leibniz, Wolff, Spinoza, Rosseau, and Kant, with early modern theology. Regardless of what one may think of their conclusions, it is clear from these chapters that these philosophers were deeply engaged with the theological issues of their day, and that some even sought to defend certain theological ideas. Ursula Goldenbaum notes, for example, that, 'Leibniz and Wolff after him developed their metaphysics to address the challenge modern science posed to the theologies of all three Christian denominations.' (p. 561)

In short, *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology* is an impressively wide-ranging and detailed volume that packs a huge amount into less than seven hundred pages. As a result, it will almost certainly be a key point of reference for scholars and students of both theology and early modern history for quite some time.

Russell Newton, University of Edinburgh