of determinism in the Moderate atmosphere, one given theological
colour in George Hill of St Andrews’ Calvinism or Christian Stoicism:
things and people are as they must be.

By and large Ahnert feels happy with the term ‘Moderate’ (and
‘orthodox’, as we have seen). There is some acknowledgement of
differences of opinion within that group surrounding the question of
free will and the place of the intellect between the likes of Kames
and Blair on one side, and those others such as Thomas Reid. Ahnert
does not conclude that this was so much to create a fissure or even
question whether ‘Moderate’ was really a useful term by the end of
the eighteenth century.

It is also an interesting question why the Moderates fell apart so
easily in 1805 – the presenting issue of the Leslie case, where the
Moderates wanted to test the church credentials of candidates for the
Edinburgh chair in Mathematics; the influence of Dugald Stewart –
and how they managed to rally by the next generation. Obviously if
one thinks, like Ahnert, that patronage had not been the issue for them
in the 1790s, then they would not have been the ones promoting it in
the 1830s. However, this seems a lacuna that the author would be well
placed to fill, if he is so inclined. Where the Moderates ‘went’ after
1805 is something that would also bear scrutiny.

Mark W. Elliott,
St Mary’s College, University of St Andrews

Ashley Cocksworth, Karl Barth on Prayer, T&T Clark Studies
in Systematic Theology (London; New York: Bloomsbury T&T

Ashley Cocksworth’s Karl Barth on Prayer endeavours to fill
an underdeveloped aspect of Barth’s expansive theology. At his
conclusion, Cocksworth writes, ‘For Barth, it is simply inconceivable
to arrive at an understanding of God apart from a real encounter
with the divine in prayer’ (p. 175), and that ‘[Barth’s] theology was
prayer’ (p. 179). Given these final claims, it may be surprising that
Barth’s work on prayer has lacked academic attention, especially with dialectical theology’s emphasis on direct revelation. As a result, Cocksworth sets out to explore the place of prayer within Barth.

He approaches this engagement by narrowing in on three types of prayer: contemplative, petition, and invocation. The latter two types of prayer appear positively in Barth’s writings, while the former is dismissed as self-indulgent. Contemplative prayer mirrors a form of mysticism that moves from God’s ‘self-revelation unto the unmapped inner being of God’ (p. 30) that removes the pray-er from response/ethical action. The primacy of response, however, underwrites both petitionary and invocative prayer. In petition, the ethical agent does not approach God as a means of ‘self-help’, but rather as ‘an agent capable not only of praying to God but also of being heard by God’ in a way that commands the ethical agent to act alongside praying (p. 73).

Petitionary prayer gives way to invocation as the ethical agent shifts from prayers for help to prayers for reconciliation. Cocksworth’s narration of invocation accounts for the majority of the work. It breaks down into three areas: invocation (specifically as a form of prayer), invocation as integral to Barth’s pneumatology, and invocation as political revolt. In the first instance, invocation acts as prayer that brings the pray-er into the communion between Christ and God and reconciles the individual to God (p. 95). In the second form, invocation provocatively symbolises that ‘the community is an epileptic community and the ethical agent an epileptic being called to lead an epileptic existence’ (p. 101), wherein the Holy Spirit is directly invoked to dwell and draw together the community of ethical agents. Finally, invocation has eschatological aspects. As the pray-er prays the Lord’s Prayer, that God’s Kingdom come, he makes ‘the practice of prayer [into] an unavoidably and fundamentally political event’ (p. 150). Furthermore, these invocations revolt against worldly disorders, powers, and claims of self-sufficiency. Instead the political dimensions of the Lord’s Prayer radically claim that God, not the individual, provides and has providence over not only creation, but also the life of the individual. The ‘lordlessness’ of self-sufficiency is uncovered.
As a systematic exploration of Barth on prayer across the oeuvre of Barth’s theology, Cocksworth does his due diligence. The work engages with a sweeping cross section of Barth, not only *Church Dogmatics* (which could easily provide the bulk of engagement), but also with lecture notes, early writings, and his unfinished works. Cocksworth utilises a wide range of secondary literature as well, and the engagement warrants a conclusion that this monograph shows that more work on the topic of Barth and prayer should be undertaken.

Of these areas, it is Cocksworth’s section on contemplative prayer that could bear much theological fruit, not only for Barth studies, but also for renewed understandings of contemplative prayer. As summarised above, Barth rejects contemplative prayer because it leads to an inward response from the ethical agent as opposed to outward action. Cocksworth, rather than undertaking the laborious task to locate the root of Barth’s misunderstanding of contemplative prayer, proposes that contemplative prayer has a place in Barth’s theology of Sabbath. He suggests, ‘contemplation configured in terms of the Sabbath therefore redresses the supposed elitism Barth finds in the mystical tradition so that now contemplation, like the Sabbath, is available to all – an “everyday mysticism” as it were’ (p. 46).

Enlisting Balthasar’s construction of contemplative prayer as active listening, Cocksworth maps contemplative prayer onto Barth’s Sabbath theology. For Barth, creation begins with the Sabbath, ‘a celebration of the priority of divine agency’ (p. 41) that, rather than being construed as inaction, makes it a profound *action* to rest. If contemplative prayer is understood as attentive stillness, resignation of the self, and an active form of listening for God, as Cocksworth argues Barth’s Sabbath theology is, then contemplative prayer may be understood as a form of Sabbath action. The pray-er does not fall into a quiet mysticism that negates action. Rather, the pray-er, in contemplation, actively listens for God. If correct, Cocksworth finds a way to circumvent Barth’s worry that contemplation is divorced from action by the ethical agent. The imaginative reconfiguration warrants further investigation, not only in the scope of Barth and prayer, but also Barth’s theology of Sabbath and action/response arising from active inaction and rest.
Overall, this endeavour to fill a gap in Barthian studies suggests that exploration of these more ‘pastoral’ aspects of Barth’s theology is worth further analysis. Prayer, as an essential Christian act, underwrites so much of Barth’s systematic and ethical work that those engaged in Barthian studies would do well to engage with these questions and topics.

_Claire Elizabeth Hein Blanton_,
University of Aberdeen


This very ambitious book attempts three distinct but related tasks: first, a summary of contemporary theological reflection on the nature of the church under the heading ‘communion ecclesiology’, suggesting that there is a wide consensus that has emerged historically under particular conditions and represents a new and probably temporary stage in the wider church’s thinking; second, a critique of two influential living theologians, John Zizioulas and John Milbank, both of whom MacDougall regards as spokesmen for this consensus despite their many differences and whose work he regards as falling victim to its characteristic weaknesses; third, the presentation of a development of or alternative to (this ambiguity is something to which this review will return below) communion ecclesiology that embraces another prominent tendency in contemporary theology, a strong emphasis on a future-oriented eschatology that looks forward to the transformation of this world by the action of God at an unknown time to come (MacDougall draws on the work of Pannenberg and especially Moltmann for this).

It provides an excellent introduction to the development of ecclesiology in the last fifty or so years and is well worth reading for this purpose alone. MacDougall makes an excellent case that ecumenical