CONTENTS

ARTICLES

BOOK REVIEWS

STR 5/2 (Winter 2014) 153–56

Introduction to the Volume

STR Editor

In 1841, a resident of the German village of Möttlingen approached her pastor and complained of struggles that she faced. The struggles were spiritual, or so the villager said, and they terrorized her. The pastor, Johann Blumhardt, was initially put off by the woman, but over the course of two years invested in helping her through the struggles. Through the course of his work with this certain villager, Blumhardt became convinced the woman was wrestling with demonic affliction or possession. The climax of the pastor's work with this woman came two years later, in 1843, when the struggles came to an end. In a moment of spiritual battle between the demonic power and the woman, Blumhardt purportedly heard the evil power cry out, "Jesus is the victor!" The woman was afflicted no more.

This moment profoundly shaped the theology and praxis of Blumhardt and his son, Christoph. Christoph grew up and joined the ranks of the pastorate as well. Together, they embraced a theology that understood that in that room that night, Jesus defeated the powers of Satan…he had literally reigned victorious in the life of that afflicted woman. After that moment, a revival broke out in 1844, which spread throughout the surrounding area. The cry "Jesus is the victor!" shaped what would become a fully-orbed ministry and teaching of the Blumhardts. Johann (Blumhardt the Elder) and Christoph (Blumhardt the Younger) would preach and teach a distinctive faith in the gospel of the Kingdom of God with this cry echoing in their hearts and minds. Christian T. Collins Winn describes it in this way: "That faith, as expressed especially by the elder Blumhardt and summed up in the phrase 'Jesus is the victor!' centered on the conviction that the kingdom of God, identified with the person of Jesus and the ministry of the Spirit, was a dynamic and living power that broke into history to set humanity free from spiritual and physical bondage."[1]

---

[1] Christian T. Collins Winn, "Introduction," in Christoph Friedrich Blumhardt, *The Gospel of God's Reign: Living for the Kingdom of God* (Blum-

The influence of the Blumhardts extends beyond that revival. Their thought and ministry impacted many and developed into the Bruderhof movement that survives today. They influenced the theology of Karl Barth, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, and Emil Brunner, each of whom find stimulus and provocation from the thought of the Blumhardts.[2] Jürgen Moltmann draws upon their work to understand the place of humanity and the remainder of the created order in God's kingdom.[3] The Blumhardts, with their emphasis upon the work of the Spirit, have influenced Pentecostal and Charismatic theology in the present day as well. This is evidenced, in part, by the myriad of academic resources on the Blumhardts coming from those Christian circles and academic institutions affiliated with Pentecostal and Charismatic theology.[4] All in all, the shadow of the Blumhardts looms large.

Still, the rallying point of this theology, "Jesus is the victor!," draws us to fundamental questions of the meaning of the gospel of Jesus Christ and the coming of the kingdom of God. Indeed, the theology of the Blumhardts can tend towards chiliasm the coming of the kingdom *now* through the signs and wonders of healing and demonic overthrow. Despite this, the elder Blumhardt especially understood (rightly) that the kingdom expressions in the present day were *signs* pointing to ultimate consummation of God's kingdom in the future. But it is nonetheless tempting to see signs as ultimate, especially when progress is made in the world today. The Blumhardts (especially the younger Christoph) took the chiliasm further and their name is associated with the Christian Socialists in

---

hardt Series; ed. Christian T. Collins Winn and Charles E. Moore; trans. Peter Rutherford, Eileen Robertshaw and Miriam Mathis; Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2014), p. xx.

[2] See, for example, Blumhardt's influence on Barth in David Paul Henry, *The Early Development of the Hermeneutic of Karl Barth as Evidenced by His Appropriation of Rom. 5:12–21* (NABPRDissSer 5; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), pp. 104–106; Christian T. Collins Winn, *'Jesus is the Victor!' The Significance of the Blumhardts for the Theology of Karl Barth* (Princeton Theological Monograph Series 93; Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2009). For Blumhardt's influence on Bonhoeffer, see Jürgen Moltmann, *Sun of Righteousness, Arise!: God's Future for Humanity and the Earth* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2010), pp. 79–81. We should note that Blumhardt's influence on Moltmann appears in this volume!

[3] Moltmann, *Sun of Righteousness*.

[4] See the Blumhardt Series published by Cascade, for instance.

Germany in the early twentieth century. The gospel, for the Blumhardts, centered upon the victory of Jesus over all powers through his death and resurrection. But this meant that his kingdom would not be—indeed could not be—equated with an escape from the world but rather a reorientation to it.

So, even though God brings both 'signs of the kingdom' as well as the kingdom itself, the Christian community was called to struggle alongside God for the coming God's kingdom. This struggle manifested itself not only in seeking healing through prayer, fasting, and worship, but also in and through active service, works of mercy, and justice. All of these were tangible forms of witness to the coming kingdom, concrete enactments of the second petition of the Lord's Prayer: 'Thy kingdom come!'[5]

The story of the Blumhardts needs to be heard again today, not only because of its interest for Church historians, but also (and significantly) because of the way that that story reminds us of how we understand the fundaments of the Christian faith: the gospel, the nature of the kingdom of God, and the role and nature of Christian mission in God's world today.

This edition of *STR* is loosely themed around one of the fundaments identified above: the kingdom of God. In this volume, authors engage the nature of the kingdom from a variety of perspectives. In our first essay, Andrew Dearman explores the link between the genealogy of David at the close of the book of Ruth and its ties to the national storyline of Israel. His work is important, because it connects the Davidic line to God's purposes in salvation. As Dearman will conclude, the book of Ruth is "a part of a national storyline running from the ancestral accounts to the dynasty of David, with YHWH at work over generations to preserve a chosen family (the "House of Israel")." God's work with this house will then be found in the ministry of Jesus, the King (See Matt. 1:1, for example). The king of the Kingdom of God is the Davidic king of Israel. Dearman's essay is followed by an interview with Dr. Jeremy Treat. *STR* invited Treat to contribute because of his most recent publication *The Crucified King*. His volume draws together atonement theology and the kingdom of God in provocative and fresh ways. Treat's essay is followed by Joshua Chatraw's article on the concepts of repentance and forgiveness in Jesus' teaching. His work is important, because repentance is the doorway to the king-

[5] Collins Winn, "Introduction," pp. 20–21.

dom of God (at least on Mark 1:14–15!). Chatraw's real target here, is how N.T. Wright understands concepts within the larger framework of his hermeneutical programme. Chatraw assesses Wright's approach hermeneutically and then provides a different take on Wright's understanding of repentance and forgiveness according to Jesus in the Gospels. Chatraw's article reminds us that good exegesis is a necessary and indispensible tool that helps us approach God's Word so that we can hear its message of the kingdom *well* and in so doing, respond to God's call *rightly*. Finally, this volume closes with Stephen Eccher's wonderful analysis of the concept of the kingdom of God among early Swiss Anabaptists. Eccher's work is a piece of historical theology, and it serves the volume very well. It helps us understand why it is those in the Anabaptist circles of Christianity tend towards a non-territorial and (perhaps) even escapist and pietistic understanding of the kingdom of God. This is a theological move as well as a historical one.

Each of these essays, then, provides different approaches to the theme of the kingdom of God and is loosely oriented to it. It is my hope that this volume will be of interest to specialists and non specialists alike. And as we move in Advent towards Christmas, our praise today reverberates with cry of the Blumhardts: indeed "Jesus IS the victor!" Our prayer is that Christ's kingdom may come on earth as it is in heaven.

STR 5/2 (Winter 2014) 157–70

David, the Book of Ruth, and Its Place in a Larger National Storyline

J. Andrew Dearman
Fuller Theological Seminary

Introduction

The purpose of this essay is to offer supporting data for the proposal that the composer(s) of the book of Ruth drew upon and alludes to a larger national storyline to show that YHWH was at work among David's tribe and clan to bring forth his dynastic rule in Israel. On the one hand, the reception history of the book is congenial to a connection with the biblical figure of David, given the generations of Jews and Christians who have taken cues from its concluding genealogical formulae (4:17b; 4:18–22) to see the preceding narrative in light of Davidic rule, past and future.[1] On the other hand, modern, historical-critical scholarship has largely concentrated on other matters of the book's interpretation. There seem to be two related reasons for this. The first is that for decades concern for genre analysis of the book has been broadly influenced by a comment of Goethe[2] and the pioneering form-critical analysis of Gunkel.[3] Their comments are almost always noted by subsequent commentators and the book is commonly described by the

---

[1] In terms of reception history and post-biblical Jewish interpretation, see Jacob Neusner, *The Mother of the Messiah in Judaism: The Book of Ruth* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity International Press, 1993). See also footnote 25 below. For early Christian appropriation of the book, see already Matt 1:3–6 and Luke 3:31–33.

[2] "(D)as lieblichste kleine Ganze betrachtet werden kann, das uns episch und idyllisch überliefert worden ist," in Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Berliner Ausgabe. Poetische Werke* (Band 3, Berlin: Aufbau Verlag, 1960) p. 165.

[3] Hermann Gunkel, "Ruth," *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913) pp. 65–92 used the terms "idyll" and "novella" to describe the book. See further E. F. Campbell, Jr., "The Hebrew Short Story: Its Form, Style and Provenance," pp. 83–101 in H. N. Bream, R. D. Heim, and C. A. Moore, ed., *A Light Unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974).

related terms "idyll," "novella," or "short story," with a presenting problem to be overcome, and with certain characters who become positive role models. Within this genre-based approach David receives little attention, given that he is only noted at the end of the book and is not a character developed in it. There is, of course, much to be learned from this approach to the book and it does not, furthermore, deny the influence of traditions about David upon the perspective and preservation of the book, even if these traditions are not deemed primary to the crafting of the narrative as such.[4]

The second and related reason is a plausible literary judgment that the longer genealogical list in 4:18–22, which moves from Perez to David, is an addition to the novella or short story proper.[5] Some interpreters have drawn a similar conclusion regarding the other explicit reference in the book to David (4:17b), namely, that it too is an editorial addition to an earlier narrative. Such judgments are wrapped up in discussions of the date of the book, with some proposing a pre-exilic origin (with the genealogical formulae as editorial additions in the post-exilic period) and others opting for a post-exilic origin to the narrative (though again it may have subsequent editorial updates).[6] As with the modern discussion of genre,

---

[4] One common way to interpret the book is to see it opposing an unwarranted exclusion of foreigners in Israel and/or marriage restrictions set out in Ezra and Nehemiah, using David's family as an example. For representative discussions and approaches, Georg Braulik, "The Book of Ruth as Intra-Biblical Critique of the Deuteronomic Law," *AcT* 19 (1999), pp. 1–20; Yair Zakovitch, *Das Buch Rut: Ein jüdischer Kommentar* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1999); André *LaCocque, Ruth: A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004); Agnethe Siquans, "Foreignness and Poverty in the Book of Ruth: A Legal Way for a Poor Foreign Woman to be Integrated into Israel," *JBL* 128 (2009), pp. 443–52; Tamara Cohn Eskenazi and Tikva Frymer-Kensky**,** *The JPS Bible Commentary: Ruth* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2011).

[5] C. McCarthy, "The Davidic Genealogy in the Book of Ruth," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 9 (1985), pp. 53–62. He concludes that 4:18–22 is an addition to the narrative, post-exilic in date, and that its contents are derived from 1 Chron 2:3–15.

[6] See representative discussions in O. *Loretz, Das Verhältnis* zwischen *Rut*-Story und David-Genealogie im Rut-Buch," *ZAW* 89 (1977), pp. 124–26: an earlier form of the story ended at 4:16; E. F. Campbell, Jr., *Ruth* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co: 1975), pp. 169–73: the basic narrative is pre-exilic and 4:18–22 is a post-exilic addition; Erich Zenger, *Das*

such a literary judgment about 4:18–22 or 4:17b does not deny the influence of traditions about the figure of David on the preservation of the narrative proper; indeed, in this case it assumes that an editor wanted to underscore such a connection between narrative and royal figure! Nevertheless, it also assumes that an earlier narrative, *sans* the genealogical formulae, may have been composed with purposes in mind unrelated to David, and that it needed such explicit references to confirm a connection or to widen the book's appeal.

Genre

The value of the modern discussion of Ruth's genre is borne out in the manner in which matters of plot and character development can be coordinated and evaluated.[7] Nevertheless, there is more to be said about the particularities of Ruth's account with respect to plot and detail and their connections to a national storyline and David. Nielsen, for example, who accepts the basic genre designation of novella for the book, claims that, "the texts in the Old Testament that Ruth most closely resembles are the patriarchal narratives."[8] She means that in matters such as (A.) the problem of barrenness, (B.) the motif of an extra-ordinary sexual scene, (C.) surrogates for conception and birth of children, (D.) explicit references to ancestral figures, and (E.) the *tōledōth* genealogical formula, Ruth's novella is particularly influenced by the ancestral accounts in Genesis that also have these things:

A. *Barrenness of women:*

Sarah, 16:1–2; Rebecca, 25:21; Rachel, 29:31//Ruth

B. *Extra-ordinary sexual scene:*

Buch Ruth (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1986; 2nd edition, 1992), pp. 93–95: the primary narrative is post-exilic in written form and 4:17b, 18–22 are editorial additions to it.

[7] Dana Nolan Fewell and David Miller Gunn, *Compromising Redemption: Relating Characters in the Book of Ruth* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999); Marjo C.A. Korpel, *The Structure of the Book of Ruth* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2001); Kristin Moen Saxegaard, *Character Complexity in the Book of Ruth* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

[8] Kirsten Nielsen, *Ruth: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), p. 7.

Lot's daughters, 19:30–38; Leah for Rachel, 29:15–30; Tamar and Judah, 38:12–19//Ruth and Boaz at the threshing floor[9]

C. *Surrogates for conception and offspring:*
Hagar, 16:1–6; Bilhah and Zilpah, 30:1–13; Judah, 38:1–30//Boaz

D. *References to ancestor figures:*
Rachel and Leah, 29:1–30:24 Judah, Tamar and Perez, 38:1–30//Ruth 4:11–12

E. *Tôledôth genealogical formula:*
e.g. 36:1; 37:2//Ruth 4:18–22.[10]

From this perspective, Ruth's novella is intended to further a national storyline rooted in the ancestral accounts in Genesis and to update it by reference to events "in the days of the Judges" (1:1) that prepared the way for David's family and his dynasty. With varying emphases, others support her basic literary and intertextual approach to the book.[11] Van Wolde's conclusion is persuasive: "The relationship between the book of Ruth and the patriarchal narratives in Genesis…is a matter not just of direct similarities between persons or terms, but of an underlying pattern."[12] She and Nielsen represent an appreciation for the book's basic genre identification, coupled with recognition that thematic and intertextual links to the accounts of Israelite ancestors impact its shape and

---

[9] There is no explicit statement in 3:6–13 that Boaz and Ruth engaged in sexual relations at the threshing floor. The account does, however, have sexual overtones and represents an extra-ordinary encounter between the two.

[10] Nielsen, *Ruth*, p. 27, proposes that the genealogy is the book's "basic premise and starting point" as part of its defense of David and his family. Even if 4:18–22 is an addition, Gilles Gerleman, *Ruth/Das Hohelied* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), pp. 5–10, 38, also sees the book's purpose as defending the family of David and explaining his Moabite connections as part of God's leading of the people.

[11] Harold Fisch, "Ruth and the Structure of Covenant History," *VT* 32 (1982), pp. 425–37; Ellen van Wolde, *Ruth and Naomi* (London: SCM Press, 1997); Irmtraud Fischer, "The Book of Ruth: A 'Feminist' Commentary on the Torah?," pp. 24–29 in Athalya Brenner, ed., *Ruth and Esther. A Feminist Companion to the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); idem, *Rut* (2nd edition; Freiburg: Herder, 2005). Note the considerable list of "parallels" between Genesis and Ruth provided by Robert Hubbard, *Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), p. 40.

[12] *Ruth and Naomi*, pp. 131–32.

perspective. The elements of threat, character development, and resolution in Ruth are not just constituent elements of a novella, generally speaking; their particularities are decisively shaped by material in the Genesis ancestral accounts and intended for a similar purpose, namely, to show that God is at work through a particular family and tribe to bring blessing to them and through them for future generations. Although the Ruth novella stands alone, literarily speaking, it depends upon a larger storyline of national interest and interprets it for readers.

Genealogical Formulae

The two genealogies contain the only explicit references to David in the book (4:17b; 22). They place the marriage of Boaz and Ruth and the birth of Obed in the context of an extended family history of ten generations that stretches from Perez (cf. Gen 38) to the person of David. They also complement a reference to Perez earlier in the chapter (4:12). One textual tradition (Old Latin) goes to an eleventh generation in the concluding verse with the mention of Solomon. Genealogies are constituent parts of Old Testament narratives, providing social mapping as well familial data, but no other Old Testament book concludes with one. Ruth is unique in this regard, whatever its compositional history.

Ruth 4:17 indicates that the son born to Boaz and Ruth was named Obed, who was "the father of Jesse, the father of David." Ruth 4:18–22 repeats and supplements these data: "These are the generations (*tōledōth*) of Perez: Perez fathered Hezron, Hezron fathered Ram, Ram fathered Aminadab, Aminadab fathered Nahshon, Nahshon fathered Salmah, Salmon fathered Boaz, Boaz fathered Obed, Obed fathered Jesse, and Jesse fathered David" (Masoretic Text). As commentators are quick to point out, there are variants preserved for several names in 4:18–22 in both Hebrew and early versions, along with parallel texts in Matt 1:3–6 and Luke 3:31–33.[13] They reflect fascinating matters in textual transmission history, but are less important overall for exploring the book's relationship to traditions about King David and will be commented upon only sparingly.

The genealogical formulae follow the exclamations of the village women in 4:14–15, 17a, that Obed is a "kinsman redeemer (*go'ēl*)"

[13] Campbell, *Ruth*, pp. 170–72.

and "son" for Naomi (mother of Mahlon, Ruth's deceased husband).[14] Thus there are two identities for Obed given in chapter 4, one which links him to the property and identity of the household of Mahlon, and another given in the genealogical formulae themselves, which place him in the line of Boaz and David. A similar situation is set out in Gen 38, an account known to and drawn upon by the composer(s) of Ruth. Tamar, the childless widow of Er, conceives twins by an unwitting surrogate, namely, her father-in-law Judah, after Judah had refused to allow his youngest son Shelah to engage Tamar in levirate marriage (cf. Deut 25:5–10). Perez and Zerah are linked elsewhere in the OT with the line of Judah (Gen 46:12; Num 26:19–22; 1 Chron 2:3–4; Ruth 4:12), their biological father, just as Obed is linked with Boaz (Ruth 4:21; 1 Chron 2:12), rather than Mahlon. Clearly the genealogical data themselves do not preserve all of the familial roles played by either Perez or Obed in the tribal inheritance of Judah.

The Hebrew phrase "these are the generations (*tōledōth*)" in 4:18 occurs elsewhere in the OT to provide genealogical data for readers.[15] Its employment is frequently associated with the Priestly writer or tradent, which means for some interpreters that it is post-exilic in origin and a reason to consider 4:18–22 as an appendix to an earlier narrative. As noted above, the genealogical data for the Judahite clan of Perez in 1 Chron 2:3–15 closely overlap with the linear genealogy in Ruth 4:18–22 and the brief notice in Gen 38:27–30. In formal terms, however, the two genealogies in 1 Chronicles 2 and Ruth 4 are separate sources. Ruth 4:18–22 is a typical descending genealogy, while the longer data collection in 1 Chron 2:3–15 is segmented. Possibly the data in 1 Chronicles 2 and Ruth 4:18–22 derive from a common antecedent and were included in their respective documents at a similar time. The two accounts share one name in common over against a variety of variants among early versions and textual witnesses, Ram the father of Aminadab (Ruth 4:19; 1 Chron 2:9–10).[16]

---

[14] According to Ruth 4:5, 10, the marriage of Ruth to a kinsman of her dead husband was to maintain the name of the deceased with his inheritance through the birth of an heir.

[15] Gen 2:4; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 19; 36:1, 9; 37:2; Num 3:1; 1 Chron 1:29.

[16] In Greek texts, the name is Αρραν or Αραμ or Αδμιν; Cf. BHS and Matt 1:3–4; Luke 3:33. See also footnote 21 below for another shared

Whether one or more of the genealogies are editorial additions is a subjective literary judgment, given that all surviving textual forms of the book contain them. If the book is a post-exilic work, as a recent detailed examination plausibly concludes, then there is less reason to see 4:18–22 as an appendix.[17] Nevertheless, even if 4:18–22 (or less plausibly 4:17b) is deemed an editorial update, the discussion above regarding various connections to the ancestral accounts in the book do not support a thematic difference between the genealogy reaching back to Perez and the preceding narrative. As the book of Genesis combines genealogical lists with narratives for selected entities, so does the book of Ruth. The uniqueness of the latter is that the genealogy concludes the account in an explicit effort to point forward, literarily speaking, to a subsequent phase in national history brought about by YHWH's providential work, whereas in Genesis the *tōledōth* formulae function more like hinges within the book, introducing and narrowing a subject matter and elaborating on select figures.[18] Ruth also has connections to the Chronicler, who likewise draws on earlier sources in linking Israel's history by combining genealogical data (1 Chron 1–9) and narrative.

Family Identity

The book introduces its first characters as "a man from Bethlehem in Judah" and his immediate family who are described as "Ephrathites from Bethlehem" (1:1–2). These identity markers provide local color and verisimilitude for the account, yet are not incidental to it, as if Ruth's composer could just as easily portray Elimelech's family as Abiezrites from Ophrah in Manasseh (cf. Judg 6:11–15). That identity would not connect the family to Judah and David, as do Bethlehem and Ephrathah. David is identified elsewhere as the son of an "Ephrathite" from Bethlehem named Jesse (1 Sam 17:12). The common description of Elimelech and Jesse is possibly a coincidence, but not likely so, as they and Boaz are the only men in the OT specifically identified with the double

---

attribute between Ruth and the genealogical data for the tribe of Judah in 1 Chron 2:3–4:23.

[17] Peter Hon Wan Lau, *Identity and Ethics in the Book of Ruth: A Social Identity Approach* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), pp. 145–90.

[18] See further, Matthew A. Thomas, *These are the Generations: Identity, Promise, and the 'Toledot' Formula* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2011).

entity Ephrathah/Bethlehem. The book of Ruth, which twice refers to Jesse (4:17b; 22), thus points readers to a specific Ephrathite family from the very beginning and one with roots in a larger storyline (4:11–12). Like bookends, the description of Elimelech and his family in 1:1–2 and the concluding genealogical formulae in 4:17b–22 illumine and interpret one another.[19]

The name Ephrath/Ephrathah does have some obscurities related to it in other biblical references, but they cannot be dealt with adequately in this context.[20] In Ruth, Ephrathah is a geographical name overlapping with Bethlehem (4:11) and possibly also a clan name (1:2). There is a shaping tradition at work in some of the references elsewhere to relate Ephrathah to Bethlehem and David. For example, Rachel's burial is noted twice in Genesis as located on the Ephrathah road (35:19; 48:7) and in both cases an editor adds an explanatory comment that Ephrathah/Ephrath is Bethlehem. Micah 5:2 contains a prophecy that one from the past shall be ruler of Israel and he shall come from "Bethlehem Ephrathah," an otherwise insignificant clan. It is part of a *David redivivus* tradition found in several prophetic books (Hos 3:5; Isa 11:1–9; Jer 23:5–6; 30:9; 33:15; Ezek 34:23–24) and unique among them in drawing upon the geography of David's origin. Finally, there is the New Testament reference to Bethlehem as the "city of David" (Luke 2:4, 11). One cannot determine how far back in Jewish lore such a term goes; it is, however, another example of David's impact in shaping geographic terminology and a national narrative that uses it.

Building the House of Israel

Those who witness the transaction in the gate offer Boaz felicitations for progeny and increased standing in Ephrathah/Bethlehem (4:11–12). There are remarkable elements in this communal response to the pending marriage of Ruth and Boaz, which are illuminated through allusion and echo to other texts. Among other things, those present express hope that Ruth, who is coming into Boaz's "house," will be like Rachel and Leah, who "built the House of Israel," and that through the "seed" the Lord

---

[19] So Lau, *Identity*, p. 53; Nielsen, *Ruth*, pp. 3, 23.

[20] See discussion in Campbell, *Ruth*, pp. 54–55. Cf. 1 Chron 2:19, where Ephrath is the wife of Caleb; 2:50–51, where Salma, a descendant of Ephrathah, is the father or founder of Bethlehem; and 4:4, where Ephrathah is the father or founder of Bethlehem.

will give him through her, his "house" will be like that of "Perez, whom Tamar bore to Judah." We should take careful note of the combining of family, tribal and national identities in the people's response. This is no generic blessing. Every name just listed, personal or geographic, can be found in the ancestral narratives in Genesis. The line of kinship and place runs from Boaz's "house," sometimes translated as "family," to Ephrathah / Bethlehem, to the house of Perez, to Judah, the progenitor of the tribe, and to Israel, the progenitor of the nation as household. This is perhaps too linear a way to present the data, but they are impressive in connecting Boaz and Ruth to an extensive family history as part of a larger national narrative. Even in its brevity, Ruth's book draws on these ancestral family traditions (i.e., those before the "days of the Judges") more explicitly than do the books of Judges and 1–2 Samuel. Indeed, these books lack any reference to the activities of the ancestors named in Ruth 4:11–12 or any of the ancestors named in David's genealogy before Jesse. As noted previously, Judah, Tamar and Perez also occur in 1 Chronicles, a book that has portions of Judah's genealogical data in common with Ruth, (4:17b, 18–22; 1 Chron 2:3–15). The ancestral traditions in Ruth 4:11–12 are thus specifically related to data preserved in Genesis and 1 Chronicles, even as they point forward to David, providing another link between the narrative proper and the genealogical formulae.[21]

Rachel and Leah are paired in Genesis and Ruth, but nowhere else in OT texts. The women and their servant surrogates, Bilhah and Zilpah, are the mothers of Jacob/Israel's sons (Gen 35:23–26), whose descendants comprise the later "House of Israel." In terms of a national storyline, this puts Ruth and her commitments to Mahlon and Naomi in exalted company, even as her personal story has parallels to Jacob's family dynamics. The ancestral narratives in Genesis 12–50, for all their complexity and detail, are shaped as a four-generation, extended family history that leads to a nation called Israel. The felicitations to Boaz in Bethelehem's gate assume elements in this larger narrative matrix and draw from them.

---

[21] Both the account in Ruth and that in 1 Chron 2:3–4:23 reckon with the inclusion of foreign women in the tribe of Judah. See Gary N. Knoppers, "'Married into Moab': the exogamy practiced by Judah and his descendants in the Judahite lineages," pp. 170–91 in Christian Frevel, ed., *Mixed Marriages: Intermarriage and Group Identity in the Second Temple Period* (London: T & T Clark, 2011).

As noted above, Judah, Tamar and Perez are the specific tribal/clan/household connections for Boaz and David among the descendants of Israel. Their names in Ruth echo the accounts in Genesis 38 and 1 Chron 2:3–4, where the continuation of the biological line of Judah is at stake and Judah's widowed daughter-in-law produces heirs by unexpected means. The parallels between Ruth and Tamar, on the one hand, and Boaz and Judah on the other, are dramatic and cleverly signaled through brief allusion. They remind readers that the marriage of Boaz and Ruth comes at yet another crucial juncture in a family history overseen by YHWH.

There is more echo and allusion to these ancestral narratives in the remark that Rachel and Leah "built (*bānāh*) the House of Israel." The phrase "to build a house," when used of kinship ties rather than construction of a building, is a metaphor, idiomatic in expression and embedded in cultural practices different than those of the modern West. The metaphor's vehicle is physical construction of a domicile; its tenor is the establishment and preservation of a family, and can include the use of surrogates for procreation purposes. On occasion, the verb alone can have this sense. Rachel encouraged her husband to procreate with her servant Bilhah so that "I can be built (niphal) from her" (Gen 30:3; cf. 16:2 and Sarah/Hagar). The noun *bayit* has physical connotations (domicile, physical residence, building, palace, and temple) and kinship connotations (household, family, clan, tribe, dynasty, and patrimonial nation-state), depending on use in context. It is used four times in 4:11–12, representing various kinship identities. The phrase "build a house" is used in Deut 25:9, where it refers to the perpetuation of a family, just as it does in Ruth 4:11. More specifically, it occurs in a case law (Deut 25:5–10) regarding a married man who dies without an heir. The presenting issue of the case law is whether or not his brother then takes the widow as wife in order to "build a house" for the deceased, i.e. to provide an heir for him. The phrase in Ruth may also allude to the ancestors' various employments of surrogates to increase their offspring, for this is something the narrative has in common with the accounts of Rachel, Leah, Judah, and Tamar. The phrase portends what Ruth and Boaz (a surrogate for Mahlon, cf. 4:5, 10) will accomplish in providing an heir for the deceased.

"Building the House of Israel" is also an echo of a promise to David that YHWH "will build a house" for him (stated explicitly in 1 Chron 17:10). That promise is part of a central tradition about

David[22] and his dynastic rule over Israel, where the word *bayit* is used repeatedly with several of the physical and kinship connotations noted above (1 Chron 17:1–27/2 Sam 7:1–29). To summarize: David, who has built his *house* in Jerusalem, would like to build a *house* for YHWH. The prophet Nathan responds that instead it is YHWH who will "build a *house*" for David (*bānāh*, 1 Chron 17:10; *'aśāh*, 2 Sam 7:11). David's "descendant" (*zera'*), who follows him in dynastic succession, is the one who will build a *house* for YHWH. David prays with thanksgiving to YHWH that "the *house* of your servant David will be established before you" (1 Chron 17:24/2 Sam 7:26). In Ruth's novella, the "House of Israel" built proleptically by Rachel, Leah and Ruth, extends all the way to the house of David built by YHWH. That is the nature of an echo that goes back and forth, literarily speaking, between texts with common terms and themes.

There are only small differences between the versions of 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicle 17 regarding the house of David and YHWH. Of the two, the Chronicler uses the phrase "build a house" in the sense of perpetuate and establish a family (17:10), as in Ruth 4:11. The parallel passage in 2 Samuel has the verb *'āśāh* instead of *bānāh* (7:11). It amounts to the same sense as the Chronicler's formulation, but is a step removed from verbal correspondence in Ruth. Given previous observations about the links between Ruth and Chronicles, the closer connection between the two here is not surprising.

There is at least one more echo in Ruth 4:12, also reverberating back to the ancestral history as well as forward to David's house. It comes in the expressed hope that YHWH will give Boaz "offspring," literally "seed" (*zera'*), through Ruth. The noun is a collective singular and readily refers to one or more offspring. We should note that it is YHWH who will give Boaz offspring. Behind such an expression are dramatic accounts in the ancestral narratives of Genesis, where wombs had been closed until YHWH acted. It was so with Sarah (Gen 16:1–2), Rebecca (Gen 25:21), and Rachel (Gen 29:31). Until her marriage to Boaz, it had been that way with Ruth. In the literary shaping of these narratives is an emphasis on the *seed* of promise (e.g. Gen 12:7; 15:2, 5; 22:16–18; 26:24; 28:13–15), when wombs are opened, children born, and the family continues

[22] Michael Avioz, *Nathan's Oracle (2 Samuel) and Its Interpreters* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005).

toward an expansive blessing promised to its *offspring/seed* (Gen 22:17–18; cf. 12:1–3).[23] That blessing even includes kings and rulers to come from the seed of promise (35:11–12; 49:10 = from Judah). The felicitation of the crowd in reference to *seed* is almost prophet-like. The echo moves forward from 4:12 to the *seed* that becomes king over Israel, as made explicit in the genealogical formulae that conclude the book.

YHWH's Full Reward and Wings

In his first encounter with Ruth (2:12), Boaz offers the following blessing: "May the Lord repay your effort and may your wages be full from the Lord the God of Israel, to whom you come to have refuge under his wings." The blessing reflects general Israelite piety in action. Boaz offers her praise and blessing for the manner in which she has cared for her mother-in-law (2:11) and he apparently takes her presence in the field as more of the same. Somewhat oddly, he initially addresses her as "daughter" (2:7), but this may be taken as a polite gesture and possibly reflects his status as a beneficent older member of the community. The terminology, however, deserves further scrutiny in light of the larger family history of which Ruth and Boaz are a part.

The latter part of the blessing is a poetic metaphor used six times in the Psalter, where there are various formulations of taking refuge with YHWH and his "wings" (Psa 17:8; 36:8; 57:1; 61:5[4E]; 63:8[7E]; 91:4). These and Boaz's blessing to Ruth comprise the seven instances of the metaphor in the OT. YHWH's "wings" (singular *kānāp*) may liken his protective act to that of a bird (cf. Psa 91:4) with its young or possibly refer to the winged cherubim of the temple sanctum (cf. Psa 61:5), which represent YHWH's enthroned presence among his people. Within the book itself Boaz's blessing on Ruth has a dramatic echo when she requests that he spread his garment (literally "wing") over her to fulfill the role of a kinsman-redeemer (3:9). In her case, the spread garment symbolizes a man taking a woman in marriage (cf. Ezek 16:8; Deut

[23] T.D. Alexander, "From Adam to Judah: the Significance of the Family Tree in Genesis," *EvQ* 61 (1989), pp. 5–19; idem, "Further Observations on the Term 'Seed' in Genesis," *TynBul* 48 (1997), pp. 363–67; James Hamilton, "The Seed of the Woman and the Blessing of Abraham," *TynBul* 58 (2007), pp. 253–73. See the further development of this theme in Gal 3:6–18.

23:1[22:30E]; 27:20). In the artistry of the composer, the echo between 2:12 and 3:9 functions like promise and fulfilment. Whereas Boaz initially sought YHWH's fit response to Ruth's familial fidelity, circumstances bring him to the fore as a redeemer (*go'ēl*) in extending a *wing* for Ruth's security and the preservation of clan identity.

Given the exclusivity of the metaphor to the Psalms, the question can be asked if Ruth's composer also draws on some or all of these texts as a self-conscious echo of David's prayers? We may be helped in this matter by superscriptions to five of the six psalms under consideration, since they connect David to their respective contents. Psalm 91 lacks a superscription. Psalm 17 is a "prayer of David"; 36 belongs to "David, servant of the Lord"; Psalm 57 is David's plea "when he fled from Saul into a cave" (cf. 1 Sam 24); Psalm 61 is "of/for David;" and Psalm 63 is from David's time "in the wilderness of Judah." The superscriptions, of course, are secondary headings to the psalms themselves and repositories of interpretive traditions for them that accrued over a considerable time.[24] They pick up on the traditions preserved elsewhere of David's musical skills (1 Sam 16:14–23; 2 Sam 23:1; Amos 6:5), composing of psalms (2 Sam 22/Psa 18), and organization of the temple choir and liturgy (1 Chron 25), joining him to individual compositions in the Psalter and sometimes linking them to events in his life (as in Psa 57 and 63). The question here is also a literary and tradition-historical one. It can be argued plausibly that Boaz and the psalmists simply drew upon stock phrases from communal Israelite piety, and though they do indeed have the metaphor of YHWH's wings in common, we should not ascribe allusive intention to Ruth's composer. Moreover, two difficult matters are joined when trying to coordinate the composition of the book of Ruth with the growth of the Davidic tradition and the superscriptions to the psalms.[25] Nevertheless, given the links elsewhere in Ruth to

---

[24] Adrian H. W. Curtis, "'A Psalm of David, When…': Reflections on Some Psalm Titles in the Hebrew Bible," pp. 49–60 in James K. Aitken, Jeremy M. S. Clines, and Christl M. Maier, ed., *Interested Readers. Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honor of D. J. A. Clines* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013).

[25] According to a *baraita* in the Talmud (Baba Bathra 14b) on the order of biblical writings, Ruth preceded the collection of Psalms as an introduction to David's compositions.

David, we might then ask if it is a coincidence that Boaz and David are the only two named figures in the OT who speak of YHWH's protective wings. It is probably no more a coincidence than that Elimelech, Jesse and Boaz are the only named figures described as Ephrathites from Bethlehem. Boaz indeed blesses Ruth with the language of Israelite piety, but in doing so, he also speaks like his descendant David, a supreme example of Israelite piety. The circumstances of David's great grandparents, whose story is being told precisely because they are his family, also reflect YHWH's preserving power. It is family history on a national scale that drives the composer to link Boaz, Ruth and David in an exquisitely told account.

Conclusion

Although it stands alone as a literary work, Ruth's novella or short story is fruitfully interpreted in light of its closest biblical parallels, namely the ancestral accounts in Gen 12–50, followed by the national history in 1 Chronicles, as well as other biblical texts to which it is linked through intertextual echo and allusion. The composer(s) presents the book as a part of a national storyline running from the ancestral accounts to the dynasty of David, with YHWH at work over generations to preserve a chosen family (the "House of Israel").

STR 5/2 (Winter 2014) 171–83

The Crucified King
STR Interviews Dr. Jeremy Treat

Introduction

It is a delight for *STR* to interview Dr. Jeremy R. Treat on the publication of his recent monograph *The Crucified King: Atonement and Kingdom in Biblical and Systematic Theology* (Zondervan, 2014). Dr. Treat is a pastor at Reality LA, a church in Hollywood, California. He also teaches at Biola University in La Mirada, California. Dr. Treat completed his doctoral studies in systematic theology at Wheaton College and prior to serving at Reality LA pastored for a number of years in the area around Seattle, Washington.

Interview with Jeremy Treat

STR: *Jeremy, thank you for speaking with STR. Why did you write this stimulating and evocative book?*

Treat: I'll never forget sitting in church as a young Christian when the preacher bellowed, in that you-should-know-this tone, "What's the number one thing that Jesus talked about throughout his life?" Lucky for me, I was sure that I did know it. After all, I had grown up in the church hearing every week about what was central to all of Christianity: the cross of Christ. As the preacher allowed a few seconds of silence to let the guilt build up for those who didn't know the answer, I smirked and prepared to mouth the words along with him. "The number one thing Jesus talked about was…"—and then he said something that nearly knocked me off my pew—"the kingdom of God!" What! The kingdom of God? What about the cross? At that moment it was as if Conviction walked into the room and slapped me in the face; and then his friend Crisis came and sat next to me for an extended talk. How could the kingdom be the thing that Jesus talked about the most, and yet it had no place in my theology, church life, or my perception of what it means to be a Christian? That day was the beginning of a journey for me, in seeking to understand why two of the most important themes in Scripture—the kingdom and the cross—have been divorced in most Christian belief and practice.

I found similar trends when I began looking for answers more broadly in Christianity. Many Christians *either* cling to

the cross *or* champion the kingdom, usually one to the exclusion of the other. The polarization of these two biblical themes leads to vastly divergent approaches: cross-centered theology that focuses on the salvation of sinners or kingdom-minded activism that seeks to change the world.

When I turned to scholarship for help I found more of the same, although not necessarily for the same reasons. Tomes on the kingdom of God never even mention the atoning work of Christ. Book after book on the atonement ignores the entire Old Testament promises and New Testament preaching about the kingdom of God. So I set out myself to answer the question: How do the coming of God's kingdom and Christ's atoning death on the cross relate?

STR: *You bring together some theological concepts that have been kept apart. We are thinking of "cross" and "kingdom," to be sure, but also "biblical" and "systematic" theologies. Let's take the latter union first. Why have you brought biblical AND systematic theology together in your work? Is it not better to keep them separate?*

Treat: I understand biblical and systematic theology to be distinct yet inseparable disciplines. Both draw from the same source of Scripture and seek to understand its unity, albeit in different ways. Biblical theology emphasizes the unity of Scripture through the unfolding history of redemption or, in literary terms, the development of the plot in its story line. Systematic theology seeks to understand the unity of Scripture through the logic of its theology and the way in which individual doctrines fit together as a coherent whole. Furthermore, biblical and systematic theology differ in their language and dialogue partners. Biblical theology aims is to set forth the theology of the Bible in its own terms, concepts, and contexts. Systematic theology seeks not only to understand the theology of the Bible, but to bring it into conversation with the tradition of the church and contemporary theology in order to communicate sound doctrine and correct false doctrine. Biblical and systematic theology, therefore, have a mutually enriching, bi-directional relationship. Systematic theology draws from, further develops, and informs biblical theology.

The integration of biblical and systematic theology is especially important for understanding the doctrines of atonement and the kingdom of God. Broadly speaking, systematic theology has given great attention to the doctrine of the atonement, but largely ignored the kingdom of God. Biblical theology, on the other hand, is dominated by the theme of the kingdom of God, and yet gives less attention to the doctrine

of the atonement. A holistic answer to the kingdom-cross divide, therefore, must bridge this gap between biblical and systematic theology, incorporating insights from both disciplines for both doctrines.

STR: *And to the former union: how do "kingdom" and "cross" go together?*

Treat: While many emphasize either the cross or the kingdom, I believe that you can't understand one apart from the other. The kingdom is the goal of the cross and the cross is the means by which the kingdom comes. My thesis, in briefest form, is that the kingdom comes by way of the cross. Within the broader spectrum of Christ's work (incarnation, life, resurrection, ascension, and session–all of which are extremely important), the cross is the defining moment in the coming of God's redemptive rule. Scripture presents a mutually enriching relationship between the kingdom and atonement that draws significantly from the story of Israel and culminates in the crucifixion of Christ the king.

STR: *So how would you define "the kingdom of God"?*

Treat: I define the "kingdom of God" as "God's *redemptive* reign through *Christ* and his *reconciled* servant-kings over the *new* creation." Because the theme of the kingdom is unveiled progressively in Scripture, I find it helpful to break this definition into two stages: 1) the design of the kingdom in creation, and 2) the coming of the kingdom in redemption.

Genesis 1–2 presents the *design* of the kingdom in creation: God's reign through his servant-kings over creation. The salient point is that God's reign through humanity over all the earth is the *telos* of Genesis 1–2, not the reality. In other words, before the fall and redemption ever entered the picture, there was a creation-consummation storyline aimed at God's glorious reign over all the earth through his image-bearers. Genesis 1–2, therefore, does not technically present a picture of the "kingdom of God" but rather a project moving in that direction, as well as the pattern by which it will be achieved. God reigning through his image-bearers over all the earth to the glory of God's name—that is the project toward which Genesis 1–2 is aimed.

So the design of the kingdom in creation is "God's reign through his servant-kings over creation." The order of the sentence reveals the order of significance in defining God's kingdom. The kingdom is first and foremost about *God's* reign, secondarily human vice-regency, and thirdly the realm of God's reign.

First, the kingdom is first and foremost a statement about God; that he reigns. The kingdom of God is not the culmination of human potential and effort but the intervention of God's royal grace into a sinful and broken world. Second, God reigns not only *over* humanity but also *through* humanity. Third, the message of the kingdom is not an escape from earth to heaven, but the very renewal of the heavens and the earth.

The design, of course, did not make it past Genesis 2 before sin fractured the relationship with God, shattered the goodness of his creation, and derailed humanity's mission to "fill the earth and subdue it" to the glory of God (Gen 1:28; cf. Psalm 8). Rather than going forth from Eden to expand the blessing of God's royal presence, they are banished from the garden to a wandering existence that instead spreads the curse.

This is where we see the coming of the kingdom in redemption. After the fall, God's kingdom remained the eschatological goal, although now in the form not only of eschatology but redemption. It was this kingdom—the *redemptive* reign of God—that Jesus proclaimed throughout his ministry. Jesus is the servant-king through whom God establishes his reign over all the earth. Christ not only fulfills the promises of the kingdom, he reveals the fullness of its meaning. The kingdom of God is God's *redemptive* reign through *Christ* and his *reconciled* servant-kings over the *new* creation. Through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the promises of the kingdom have *already* been fulfilled, though they will *not yet* be consummated until the second coming.

STR: *Why is the "kingdom of God" a vital concept to understand Jesus' cross?*

Treat: The theme of the kingdom of God both gives the narrative framework for the cross and captures in a very holistic way the aim of the cross. I'll explain each of these aspects briefly. First, the unfolding story of God's reign coming on earth as it is in heaven provides more than mere background for the cross; it is the story for which the cross is the climax. Not only is the kingdom a major theme from the Old Testament that begs for fulfillment, but Jesus himself frames his entire ministry with the coming of the kingdom of God (Mark 1:15). In the gospel of Mark, for example, Jesus proclaims his kingdom mission (Mark 1:1–8:21), explains its paradoxical nature (Mark 8:22–10:52), and then establishes the kingdom on the cross (Mark 11–16:8). While kingdom and cross are often set at odds, Mark reveals that the messianic mission culminates at Golgotha, where the crucified king establishes his kingdom by

way of the cross. One cannot properly understand the cross apart from the kingdom of God.

Second, the kingdom theme reveals the holistic aim of Christ's atoning death on the cross. Jesus came to bring God's kingdom (God's renewing reign over all creation), and he did so by going to the cross. This is why Paul glories in how God has "transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son" (Col 1:13) and then immediately declares the reconciliation of "all things" by the blood of Christ's cross (Col 1:20). Jesus went to the cross to save sinners, but he also "made us a kingdom" (Rev 1:6). The kingdom theme emphasizes the scope of salvation: God's loving rule over his creation (which also includes the defeat of his enemies; see Col 2:14–15). The creation-wide scope of salvation, however, does not flatten out God's purposes or priorities. Jesus went to the cross to save sinners, and in their wake, to renew all of his creation (see Romans 8). Christ's salvation is aimed at both the church and the cosmos, but in proper order. The church is the *focus* of salvation; the cosmos, the *scope* of salvation. At the heart of the coming kingdom is the covenant relationship with the king.

STR: *If this is the case, then how has scholarship and the Church missed this connection?*

Treat: Although there has always been confusion with or resistance to the paradoxical integration of kingdom and cross, such a stark division has not always been the case. In the first century, Barnabas declared that "the kingdom of Jesus is based on the wooden cross" (*Epistle of Barnabas* 8:5). According to Augustine, "The Lord has established his sovereignty from a tree. Who is it who fights with wood? Christ. From his cross he has conquered kings."

I believe that the kingdom-cross divide is an essentially modern problem (contra NT Wright, who blames the kingdom-cross divide primarily on the creeds of the early church and the theology of the Reformers). The kingdom-cross interplay, though largely absent today, has a rich heritage in the history of the church. I believe that there are at least six reasons that kingdom and cross have been divorced.

1. Reactionary debates: The collision between the social gospel movement of the early twentieth century and the ensuing conservative response often resulted in pendulum-swinging reductionism; either the kingdom without the cross or the cross without the kingdom.
2. The fragmentation of Scripture: If the Bible is not a unified whole, then there is no need to integrate the

seemingly incompatible ideas that God reigns and the Son of God dies.

3. The ugly ditch between biblical and systematic theology: The disciplinary divide that we spoke about above has often restricted the kingdom of God only to the discipline of biblical theology.
4. The gospels withheld as a source for theology: Kingdom and cross have not been integrated because the gospels (the place in the canon where the kingdom theme is most explicit) have largely been withheld as a source for theology.
5. Development of the states and offices of Christ: If Christ's work is divided neatly into the two categories of humiliation and exaltation, with the cross being only in the state of humiliation, then it is difficult to see how it could relate to the kingdom at all. If Christ's death is interpreted only in terms of his priestly office, then it will be troublesome to connect the cross to the kingdom.
6. Misunderstanding kingdom or cross respectively: To state the obvious, if one has a mistaken view of the kingdom or the cross respectively, then properly relating the two will be impossible.

STR: *One powerful point in your work is the idea that Jesus "establishes" his kingdom by the cross. What do you mean by this?*

Treat: Yes, the kingdom of God is established on earth by Christ's atoning death on the cross. *Establish* signals that Christ's atoning death is the decisive moment, though certainly not the only significant moment. God's kingdom was present in Jesus' life, proclaimed in his preaching, glimpsed in his miracles/exorcisms, established by his death, inaugurated through the resurrection, is being advanced by the Holy Spirit through the church, and will be consummated in Christ's return. The promise of the kingdom entailed forgiveness of sins, victory over enemies, and a new exodus—each were accomplished through Christ's work, the apex of which was the cross.

STR: *How does your analysis on kingdom and cross impact your understanding of the atonement?*

Treat: The implications are immense. The unfortunate trend in systematic theology has been to pit atonement theories against one another: on the cross Jesus *either* conquered sin and Satan *or* removed guilt *or* offered an example of self-giving love. But according to the biblical story of redemption, Jesus' atoning

death is a multifaceted accomplishment. The glory of the cross cannot be reduced to only one aspect of its accomplishment.

Penal substitution and *Christus Victor* have been the leading "theories" of atonement and they've often times been presented as mutually exclusive. I try to show that not only do we need to uphold the victory *and* propitiation of the cross, we need to understand how they fit together. I argue that Christ's penal-substitutionary death is the means for his victory on the cross—*Christus Victor* through penal substitution. Yes, Jesus is victorious on the cross; but *how* does he accomplish this victory? It's not by brute force. There are many different parts to this argument (and penal substitution doesn't carry all the weight), but the most obvious is that Satan's power over humanity is his power of accusation. But when Jesus, as the substitute, pays the penalty for sin and satisfies God's justice, Satan is disarmed of his accusatory power. His power of accusation has been rendered ineffective against those who are declared innocent and righteous in Christ.

Inasmuch as the coming of God's kingdom entails God's defeat of evil and reconciliation of sinners, *Christus Victor* and penal substitution are both essential aspects to Christ's kingdom-establishing death on the cross.

STR: *What are the implications of penal substitution and Christus Victor for your broader argument about the kingdom and the cross?*

Treat: There are at least three reasons why penal substitution must be attached to *Christus Victor* in connecting kingdom and cross. First, if our sins have not been dealt with, then the coming of God's kingdom is *not* good news. Christ's victory over Satan, demons, and death is a glorious accomplishment, but if our sins have not been atoned for, we remain under the wrath of God and outside his kingdom. *Christus Victor* alone implies that humans are merely victims of Satan who need to be rescued from the problem rather than sinners who are part of the problem. But even with Satan defeated and shackles broken, only those whose penalty has been paid can enter as citizens into the kingdom of God.

Second, penal substitution is crucial to the storyline of Scripture culminating in the kingdom of God. *Christus Victor* has recently been acclaimed by scholars who have sought to recover the eschatological framework of the cross. From Gen 3:15 forward, the victory of Christ is crucial to the story. Yes, but this argument is usually made in opposition to penal substitution, which is depicted as the result of abstract, ahistorical

systematic theology. The problem with this interpretation is that penal substitution should be understood within the story of redemption. The concepts of sin and the wrath of God are woven throughout the unfolding story of Israel, culminating in the song of the suffering servant (Isa 52:13–53:12). As Graham Cole says, "If we remove the wrath theme from Scripture, its storyline is eviscerated."

Third, penal substitution is imperative for upholding the justice of the coming of God's kingdom. The irony is thick: though the kingdom of God and a penal substitutionary interpretation of the cross both appeal strongly to the concept of justice, the two are rarely associated. The Old Testament declares, "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of his [the LORD's] throne" (Ps 97:2) and prophesies that the messiah will establish and uphold his kingdom with justice and righteousness (Isa 9:7; cf. Ps 89:14; Jer 23:5). So if the kingdom is established with justice, then where is the justice of God revealed in its fullest? Justice is revealed at the cross, where Jesus was "put forward as a propitiation . . . to show God's righteousness" (Rom 3:24–25). In other words, penal substitution upholds the justice of God in atonement, which is an essential aspect of the coming of the kingdom of God. The coming of God's kingdom, including the defeat of evil and the salvation of his people, must be in accordance with God's just character.

STR: *How has the threefold office (prophet, priest, and king) helped and hindered our understanding of the "crucified King"?*

Treat: I am greatly appreciative of the threefold office as a theological heuristic. I think it is a way of understanding Christ that draws from the story of Israel and emphasizes the multifaceted nature of Christ's person and work. But unfortunately, the threefold office has often been over-systematized: Jesus is a prophet in his life, a priest in his death, and a king in his resurrection. Although there may be a hint of truth here, these clear lines separate what Scripture holds together.

According to Scripture, Jesus is anointed as king at his baptism (Matt 3:13–17); recognized as a king throughout his ministry (John 1:49; 6:15); and, as the triumphal entry makes clear (Matt 21:1–11), Jesus approaches the cross *as king* seeking to establish his kingdom. The gospel writers are bent on showing that the cross is a *royal* accomplishment. In the gospel of Mark, for example, half of the uses of the word "king" show up in the crucifixion account in Mark 15. What fallen human understanding fails to perceive, the centurion below

the cross recognizes: "truly this is the son of God"—a royal title.

So let's continue to use the threefold office, but in a way where we uphold the importance of all three offices and where they are integrated in our understanding of the person and work of Christ.

STR: *If you don't mind, can we turn to the relationship between "the kingdom of God," the "cross," and the gospel of Jesus Christ? How are these three concepts related? In your view, what is the essence of the gospel and how should we define the gospel?*

Treat: Kingdom and cross are, of course, tied together biblically by the proclamation of the gospel, which is defined as both the coming of God's kingdom (Mark 1:15) and Christ's death and resurrection (1 Cor 15:3–4). There is one gospel with many aspects and a variety of entry points. In this fully-orbed gospel, the kingdom and the cross need not vie for position because they play different roles in the gospel story. The cross is the climax of the kingdom story, where the Messiah brings the kingdom by way of the cross. The kingdom is the aim of the cross, and the cross is the foundation for the kingdom.

Although the gospel could be defined in an assortment of ways, I offer the following summary definition (rooted in 1 Corinthians 15:3–4 and Mark 1:14–15): *The gospel is the good news of Jesus Christ, who died for our sins and rose from the dead as the fulfillment of the promised kingdom of God.* Through Christ's death "for our sins" and resurrection from the dead, the lost are forgiven of sin, reconciled to God, and given new life in the living Christ. However, in 1 Cor 15:3–4, the twice-repeated phrase "according to the Scriptures" reveals that Christ's death and resurrection are part of a broader story. And what story is that? I would say that it is a kingdom story; the same one that Jesus said he was fulfilling (Mark 1:15). In other words, the "according to the scriptures" of 1 Cor 15:3–4 places Christ's death and resurrection within the coming kingdom that the Old Testament anticipated and that Jesus announced (Mark 1:15).

The good news of the kingdom and the cross sprouts forth from the soil of the Old Testament. Although these paradoxical themes are intertwined throughout the story, the apex of Old Testament prophecy is the suffering servant of Isaiah. While the fourth servant song (Isa 52:13–53:12) has often been upheld as one of the clearest explanations of substitutionary atonement (and rightfully so), most do not acknowledge its royal context. The book of Isaiah builds an-

ticipation that God would restore his rule over creation through a messianic figure (ie, Isaiah 9, 11, 35), culminating in the "good news" of God's reign in Isa 52:7. The promise of God's kingdom, also expressed in terms of a new exodus, then finds its resolution in the surprising figure of the suffering servant of Isa 52:13–53:12. Understanding the suffering servant within the proper canonical context provides a kingdom framework for the sin-bearing, sorrow-carrying, punishment-averting, guilt-offering, place-taking, atoning death of the royal servant. The coming of the kingdom of God hinges on the suffering of the servant.

If Isaiah provides sweeping narrative for understanding the good news of the crucified king, Paul sums it up in a phrase: Christ crucified. This phrase is often heard as sheer emphasis on the cross, but when one remembers that "Christ" meant a messianic, and ultimately royal, figure, it is easy to see how Paul held Christ's majesty and meekness closely. The gospel is news because a king died. It's good news because he died for us.

Lastly, there's a lot of talk these days about "what is the gospel?" and some have rightly overcome the false dichotomy of gospel of the kingdom *or* gospel of the cross. But let's be clear here: we are not the first to care about this, nor the first to uphold kingdom and cross. Martin Luther focused immensely on justification through the cross, and yet could say, "The gospel is a story about Christ, God's and David's son, who died and was raised and is established as Lord. This is the Gospel in a nutshell." Yes, Jesus' death and resurrection, but within the broader story of Jesus reclaiming God's rightful dominion.

STR: *What does one lose if they neglect either the cross or the kingdom in their understanding of the gospel?*

Treat: The cross is absolutely indispensable to the good news of Jesus Christ. From the bruised heel of Gen 3:15 to the reigning lamb of Rev 22:1, the Bible is a redemptive story of a crucified messiah who brings the kingdom through his atoning death on the cross. Lose the cross and you lose the storyline of Scripture; in fact, you lose Christianity. As Paul said, "The message of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to those who are being saved it is the power of God." The kingdom comes in power, but power of the gospel is Christ crucified.

Furthermore, without Christ crucified, we're left to a kingdom without a king. As H. Richard Niebuhr once de-

scribed liberal theology: "A God without wrath brought men without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross." To press even further, without the cross, the coming of God's kingdom is not even good news (for us at least), for if we are not justified by the blood of Christ then we are enemies of the king and guilty before his righteousness. Only through the good news of Christ's life, death, and resurrection can we rejoice as sons and daughters of the king.

We cannot, however, forget that the one who died for us is our king. The kingdom of God is essential to a biblical understanding of the gospel. There are four reasons as to why we need this kingdom aspect of the gospel. First, we need the kingdom aspect because it emphasizes the narrative of Scripture. We need this so that we don't slip into rationalist propositions, only thinking of the gospel as bullet points—God, man, sin, salvation—in a way that has nothing to do with the storyline of the Bible.

Second, the kingdom aspect of the gospel rightly emphasizes community. We are ransomed *into the church*; the community of the king. We need this community emphasis of the kingdom so that we don't slip into American individualism where it's all about me.

Third, the kingdom emphasizes the scope of salvation. Salvation is not a matter of God tossing his creation and plucking our souls. Rather, through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, God is restoring his broken creation. We need this so that we don't slip into a Gnostic anti-materialism. God cares about your soul, your body, and all of his creation.

Fourth, the kingdom aspect of the gospel emphasizes discipleship. We are saved not only by the King, but in order to follow the King. We need this so we don't slip into a cheap grace or an easy believism that amounts to saying a prayer or coming forward during an alter call while never having any change in your life. That's not the call of Jesus nor is it the proper response to the gospel. We are ransomed by the blood of Jesus into a kingdom where we follow our King.

STR: *Where does the connection between cross and kingdom leave the Church? What we mean is this: how then shall the Church live in light of the connection between cross and kingdom?*

Treat: The kingdom-cross interplay significantly impacts following Christ today. We live on this side of the cross but in between the "already" and the "not yet" of the kingdom. So we must (1) understand the nature of God's kingdom as a cruciform

kingdom, (2) find our role within it, and (3) discover what it means to be a disciple of a king who ruled by serving.

The cross creates a community of ransomed people living under the reign of God. Inasmuch as God's kingdom is founded and forever shaped by the cross of Christ, it is truly a *cruciform* kingdom. The resurrected Jesus still bore the scars of the cross and rules from the throne as the lamb who was slain. Dietrich Bonhoeffer once said, "A king who dies on the cross must be the King of a rather strange kingdom." A strange kingdom indeed. For while the kingdoms of this world are built by force, the kingdom of God is founded on grace. The French General Napoleon Bonaparte (1769–1821) once said, "Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, and myself founded empires; but what foundation did we rest the creations of our genius? Upon force. Jesus Christ founded an empire upon love; and at this hour millions of men would die for Him."

Furthermore, just as God *established* his kingdom through the humble means of Christ's cross, so does he *advance* his kingdom through Christians who have been united to the resurrected Christ and who by the power of his Spirit are being conformed to the cross. Christians have been swept into the kingdom story, but we do not build the kingdom for God, we receive it from God (Heb 11:28). Our calling is to witness to the kingdom of God and we do so, shockingly, by taking up our crosses. God's power is made perfect in weakness and his strength is revealed through our feeble dependence on him. What's true for Jesus is true for us: Greatness in the kingdom is characterized by service and sacrifice.

The inseparability of the kingdom and the cross is a constant reminder that we are not only forgiven through the cross but we are made followers of the king. We are saved *from* sin and the kingdom of darkness, but we are saved *for* Jesus and his kingdom of light. The self-giving love of God displayed in the cross creates a people who lovingly give of themselves for the well-being of others. The kingdom of God is marked by justice, and those who have been justified before God have more reason than any to seek justice for the weak, the poor, and the oppressed.

STR: *In your view, what do you hope your work offers productively so the Church can hear God better in Scripture?*

Treat: I believe the purpose of theology is to glorify God and edify the church, so that is my prayer for this book. May we glory in the cross of Christ as we receive a kingdom that cannot be shaken. The church is the people of the cross, and yet we are

an outpost of the kingdom of God, a proleptic sign to an evil age of life under the benevolent reign of a crucified king.

I also hope that this book spurs on others to continue the conversation. By no means do I think I've said the final word and I look forward to dialoguing with others. In fact, one of my greatest joys since the book has been published has been the global response from non-Westerners. The story of a slain lamb who reigns on the throne over those ransomed from every tribe and language and people and nation (Rev 5:9–10) seems fitting for a world that is awakening to the beauty and necessity of global theology.

STR: *STR appreciates that you have a pastor's heart. What fruit have you seen develop (even in your local church) from understanding and embracing Jesus as the "crucified king"?*

Treat: Inasmuch as Christ is at the center of all we do, it affects everything. More specifically, we recently finished preaching through the gospel according Matthew and the kingdom-cross interplay was certainly present throughout the entire series. There were so many ways that many of the points I've made above came to fruition, but perhaps the clearest was the inseparability of Christology and discipleship (although we certainly didn't preach it in those terms). For Christ *and* Christians, the way of glory is the way of the cross.

STR: *Jeremy, thanks for giving of your time to talk with us about your important work. We pray that it would continue to serve to lift high the Name of Jesus.*

STR 5/2 (Winter 2014) 185–202

Jesus' View of Repentance and Forgiveness: A Hermeneutical Test Case

Joshua Chatraw
Liberty University

Introduction

Recently, in a review of Tom Wright's *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, Tom Schreiner wrote:

> It seems as if discussions on Wright easily become a matter of whether one is "for him" or "against him." But such an approach isn't helpful and blunts the kind of discussion that is needed. It is fitting to be grateful (see above) for his contributions to scholarship and for his service to the church. He is clearly not an enemy of evangelicalism but a friend. At the same time, we serve scholarship and truth in raising questions and concerns as well. If demonizing Wright is irrational, we must also beware of an uncritical adulation where any disagreement with him is viewed as an attack. Mature discussion takes place when we honestly dialogue about places where we agree and differ with kindness and grace.[1]

Building up on Schreiner's remarks, Wright's creativity and willingness to challenge traditional paradigms can be helpful, even if one is not in full agreement with his conclusions, because it forces one to go back and look at the Bible again. And in particular, for those who have the patience, it drives readers to examine how conclusions are reached. The questions that are not asked enough by the theological students who want to rush to find out "Whose right?" Or, "Whose side am I on?" are "Why are there disagreements on this issue?" Or, to put this differently, "What methodological differences are driving the different exegetical conclusions?" Evaluating the steps along the interpretive path helps to dig under the surface of debated conclusions to get to the roots of the disagreements and draw some important hermeneutical lessons.[2]

---

[1] Thomas Schreiner, "N. T. Wright Under Review: Revisiting the Apostle Paul and His Doctrine of Justification" *Credo* 4/1 (2014), p. 47.

[2] A special thanks to my former doctoral adviser and friend Andreas Köstenberger for his encouragement to write on this topic.

N.T. Wright on Repentance and Forgiveness

In *Jesus and the Victory of God* (*JVG*), Wright defines repentance, in contrast to what he labels as the "traditional" understanding, as "what Israel must do if YHWH is to restore her fortune at last," with Jesus proposing the answer to be "abandon revolutionary zeal."[3] Wright sees his understanding of Jesus' use of "repentance" as a return to the historical context in which Jesus lived rather than the ahistorical conversion sense of the word. In other words, instead of "repentance" referring to the negative side of the conversion, Jesus is primarily calling Israel to turn from their revolutionary zeal and be restored from exile. Wright argues this restoration for the nation of Israel is what Jesus means by "forgiveness." Hence, in contrast to the traditional understanding of forgiveness as God's gracious response to sinners who have responded appropriately to Jesus, Wright argues forgiveness is "another way of saying return from exile."[4] The following will trace out how Wright uses background material in order to understand how this affects both his definitions of what Jesus meant by repentance and forgiveness and his exegesis of related passages. The article will then conclude with several practical observations for interpretation.

The End of Exile Theme

Wright's understanding of the exile has served as an important background for his understanding of the entire NT, no less the Gospels and Jesus. Wright argues that most Jews in the first century would have understood themselves, "in all the senses that really mattered," to still be in exile.[5] Although a remnant had physically returned from Babylon, the prophets' message had not ultimately been fulfilled. Israel still was under the thumb of foreigners and her God had not returned to Zion.[6] While Wright's view has been directly challenged by some and simply ignored by others, it has only

---

[3] For N. T. Wright on repentance see *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), pp. 247–51.

[4] N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 268. For his full explanation of forgiveness according to Jesus, see pp. 268–72.

[5] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 445.

[6] Ibid., pp. xvii–xviii.

been strengthened by a series of works that affirm Wright's central thesis and provide more detailed support.[7]

Once this national expectation is accepted as the hope of many first century Jews, it has implications for understanding Jesus' message. Wright has tightly connected the exile theme from the OT and Second Temple literature with how the concepts of forgiveness and repentance are used in the Gospels and in some instances there is merit to such a connection due to the use of the concepts in the context of a future return from exile. Yet, while not denying these connections exist, there are a considerable number of instances in the OT where repentance and forgiveness are used with reference to the individual, and often when the Second Temple literature speaks of these concepts, it refers back to these examples of repentance and forgiveness in the Hebrew Bible. In other words, as the next section will show, the OT backdrop is more diverse in how such terms are used than is portrayed in *JVG*.

---

[7] Thomas R. Schreiner, "Justification: The Saving Righteousness of God in Christ," *JETS* 54 (2011): p. 19–20, who challenges many of Wright's views on other issues, has noted, "I also want to say that I think Wright is fundamentally right in what he says about the exile. Jesus came proclaiming the end of the exile and the restoration of the people of God. Perhaps exile is not the right word to use (I do not have any quarrel with it), but the idea is on target in any case. Israel was under the thumb of the Romans in Jesus' day because of its sin and had not yet experienced the fulfillment of the great promises found in Isaiah and the prophets." Also see Craig Evans, "Jesus & and the Continuing Exile of Israel," in *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus & the Victory of God* (ed. Carey C. Newman; Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1999), pp. 77–100; James C. VanderKam, "Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian conceptions* (ed. James M. Scott; Boston: Brill, 1997), p. 89–109; T. R. Hatina, "Exile," *DNTB*, p. 348; Douglas S. McComiskey, "Exile and the Purpose of Jesus' Parables (Mark 4:10–12; Matt 13:10–17; Luke 8:9–10)," *JETS* 51 (2008): pp. 59–85. Passages cited in favor of Wright's conclusions include: 4QDa 1:3–11; Tob 14:5–7; Bar 2:6–15; 3:6–8; 2 Macc. l:27–29; 2:5–8, 18; 1QM 1:2–3; CD 1:3–11; 1 En. 93:1–10; 91:11–17; T. Levi 16–17; Pss. Sol. 9:1–11; Sib. Or. 3.265–290; T. Jud. 23; T. Zeb. 9:5–9; T. Naph. 4:1–5; 4 Ezra 1:31–52; 5:17–18, 28–30; 6:55–59; 10:7–24; 12:46–51; 2 Apoc. Bar. 3:1–9; 67:1–9; 80:1–7; Tg. Isa. 53:8; and Jub. 1:7–18.

The Old Testament as Background

In the Hebrew Scriptures repentance and forgiveness are seen both at the corporate and individual level.[8] Wright correctly writes that such prayers as those within Daniel 9, Ezra 9, and Nehemiah 9 are "precisely designed to bring about the return from exile."[9] Furthermore, numerous OT passages highlight the corporate eschatological repentance and forgiveness that was foretold by the prophets (e.g., Isa 2:21–31; 30:19–22; 31:6–32:8; 35:5–10; 55:1–13; 60–61; Jer 31:27–34; Ezek 36:16–32; Hos 14:4).

Nevertheless, repentance for personal sins was also a feature in the OT. The Law required individuals to confess their sins and for individual sins to be atoned (e.g., Lev 5:5; Num 5:6–7; 15:27–31). Individuals are regularly portrayed as confessing sin in hope of forgiveness (e.g., Gen 50:17; 1 Sam 15:24–25; 2 Sam 12:13; Job 42:6). Moreover, the wisdom literature appears to emphasize the importance of repentance and forgiveness for individuals within the covenant community. For example, Prov 1:23 says, "If you turn at my reproof, behold, I will pour out my spirit to you; I will make my words known to you."[10] The Psalms provides examples of repentance for sin in the form of confession (Ps 32:15; 38:18) and also proclaims blessings on those who have their sins forgiven: "Blessed

---

[8] Human repentance is normally translated in the Hebrew Scriptures as שׁוב. However, at times נחם can be used with the same meaning (e.g., Exod 13:17; Job 42:6; Jer 8:6; 31:19). The LXX renders שׁוב with either ἐπιστρέφω or ἀποστρέφω and only with μετανοέω in Sir. 48:15. The word μετανοέω normally translates נחם in the LXX. Nevertheless, in the LXX μετανοέω and ἐπιστρέφω appears to share a substantial amount of semantic overlap.The Hebrew סלח is most frequently used to denote forgiveness in the OT, but נשׂא, כסה, מחה, and כפר are also translated as "forgiving" or "forgiveness." In LXX, nearly 20 different words are used to translate these Hebrew words in a context where they denote forgiveness: ἀφίημι (Gen 50:17a), δέχομαι (Gen 50:17b), προσεύχομαι (Exod 10:17; 34:7), ἵλεως (Num 14:20), ἐξιλάσκομαι (Num 15:28), ἀνίημι (Jos 24:19), αἴρω (1 Sam 15:25), ἱλάσκομαι (2 Kgs 5:18), καθαρίζω (Ps 19:12 MT; 18:13 LXX), εὐίλατος (Ps 99:8 MT; Ps 98:8 LXX), λασμός (Ps 130:4 MT; Ps 129:4 LXX), ἀθῳόω (Jer 18:23), ἱλάσκομαι (Dan 9:19), λαμβάνω (Hos 14:2 MT; Hos 14:3 LXX), ὑπερβαίνω (Mic 7:18), and ἀπολύω (3 Macc 7:7).

[9] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 249.

[10] For another example, Prov 28:13: "Whoever conceals his transgressions will not prosper, but he who confesses and forsakes them will obtain mercy."

is the one whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man against whom the LORD counts no iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no deceit" (Ps 32:1). While emphasizing the need for corporate repentance from sins in order to be restored to God and return from exile, the prophets do not neglect the importance of personal repentance (e.g., Isa 6:7; Jer 31:30; Ezek 18:1–32; 33:10–20).[11] The OT context can refer to both the corporate and individual aspects of these terms; therefore, it is not surprising that the authors of the Second Temple literature use the terms in both ways.

Josephus and the Use of Second Temple Literature

The importance of Second Temple literature to the present discussion is evident by the way N. T. Wright draws his conclusions concerning how "repentance" was understood in first century Galilee.[12] Wright highlights the significance of a passage from Josephus' biography in order to provide a context for Jesus' proclamation:

> Josephus has gone to Galilee to sort out the turbulent factionalism there. A brigand chief called Jesus . . . makes a plot against Josephus' life. Josephus manages to foil it. Then, he tells us, he called Jesus aside and told him "that I was not ignorant of the plot he had contrived against me . . .; I would, nevertheless, condone his actions if he would show repentance and prove his loyalty to me. All this he promised . . . [Jos. *Life* 110]." . . . Josephus is requiring of this Jesus that he give up his brigandage, and trust him (Josephus) for a better way forward. "Repentance," in this sense of abandoning revolutionary inclinations, is found elsewhere in the narra-

[11] While these texts do not exclude certain corporate implications, individual accountability to repent is evident. For example, in view of the bleak picture presented for the nation's future in Isa 6:10, J. McKeown, "Forgiveness," *DOTP*, p. 256, notes, "This seems to indicate that forgiveness is impossible, but we must remember that in this same passage God provided atonement and forgave the prophet himself when the coal from the altar touched his lips (Is 6:7). Thus, the prophet is living proof that God is still willing to restore individuals to harmony with himself."

[12] For a helpful discussion emphasizing both the importance and possible dangers with extra-biblical research, see the section entitled "The Use of Ancient Literature in Biblical Exegesis," in Michael Bird, "What is There Between Minneapolis and St. Andrews? A Third Way in the Piper-Wright Debate," *JETS* 54 (2011): pp. 299–301.

> tive; so for that matter, is "belief", in the sense of trust in and loyalty to a leader. I find it somewhat remarkable that, in all the literature I have read about Jesus of Nazareth, only one writer even mentions the incident involving Josephus and the brigand Jesus, and even he makes no comment about the meaning of "repentance" and "belief" in the light of it. *It is, I suggest, of considerable significance. That is what those words meant in Galilee in the 60's; by what logic do we insist that they meant something rather different, something perhaps more "personal", "inward", or "religious", in Galilee in the 20's and 30's*?[13]

This evidence from Josephus is offered by Wright in direct support for his conclusion that Jesus' call to repentance ". . . was not simply the "repentance" that any human being, any Jew, might use if, aware of sin, they decided to say sorry and make amends. It is the single great repentance which would characterize the true people of YHWH at the moment when their god became king."[14] Since Josephus is the featured example to make his point about "what those words meant in Galilee in the 60's," a few comments are in order.

Wright has identified one way in which the word "repentance" was used by Josephus. However, even in the example of Josephus' interaction with Jesus, Josephus is demanding repentance in the individual sense of the word.[15] Nevertheless, to conclude from such a limited survey of evidence that repentance for Jesus' audience would have automatically meant Israel "abandoning nationalistic inclinations" rather than "something perhaps more personal, inward, or religious" is hardly justified.

---

[13] N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), pp. 250–51 (emphasis added). Despite making such specific claims concerning what repentance meant in the first century, later in a context where he is arguing against E. P. Sanders that Jesus did indeed preach repentance, Wright notes, "Since the concept of 'repentance', with its personal dimension, was clearly well known within Judaism, it would be extraordinary if a call to an *eschatological* and *national* repentance were not perceived to include a call to personal repentance within it" (p. 256; emphasis Wright's). This acknowledgement is difficult to integrate with his persistent claims that within the first-century context repentance was a national summons, not something personal or inward (see pp. 248–52 of *JVG*).

[14] Ibid., p. 251.

[15] Josephus, *Life*, p. 110.

Often, Josephus can speak of repentance and forgiveness on the corporate level (Josephus, *Ant.* 2.315; 2.322; 4.195; 5.166; 6.92–93; 11.143–44; 11.156). Yet, while some of the listed examples fit well under the general heading of "turning from nationalistic zeal," in Josephus this emphasis is only a sub-category of sin from which the nation was called to repent. In the texts listed above killing, anger, speaking against Moses, desire for a human king, and violations of the Law are all examples of sins from which the people were called to repent in order to receive forgiveness. Furthermore, Josephus, often commenting on OT figures, regularly uses the concepts of repentance and forgiveness in reference to an individual (Josephus, *Ant.* 7.153; 7.193; 7.207; 7.264; 16.125; 20.42). Thus, in Josephus' writings, repentance was often an action by an individual in order to receive forgiveness both from God and others. In these examples, a variety of sins were repented from, including throwing stones, reproachful words, the avoidance of circumcision, murder, deceit, and adultery.[16]

The Return from Exile and Judgment/Salvation in Luke

Two noteworthy examples of Wright's understanding of repentance and forgiveness are found in two parables (Luke 15:11–32; 16:19–31) that are exclusive to the Gospel of Luke and provide insight into the interpretive process. Wright sees his interpretation of these parables to be supported by the larger "return from exile" theme within the Gospel. Thus, before examining these two Lukan parables, this section briefly comments on two themes within Luke

---

[16] Guy Nave has made a similar critique of Wright's use of Josephus in support of his understanding of repentance, Wright concludes, on the basis of a limited number of references to μετανοέω and μετάνοια in the writings of Josephus, that repentance in the context of Jesus' preaching entailed nationalistic violence. He fails, however, to carefully consider the more than seventy-seven references to μετανοέω and μετάνοια in Josephus' writings. What is common to all of the references in the writings of Josephus—as we all as in the writings of other Hellenistic Jewish authors of the time—is that they all refer to a fundamental change in thinking that is often accompanied by a fundamental change in living. Guy Nave, "'Repent for Kingdom of God Is at Hand': Repentance in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts," in *Repentance in Christian Theology* (ed. Mark J. Boda and Gordon Smith, Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2006), p. 90.

that assist in evaluating Wright's definition of repentance and forgiveness.

Luke emphasizes God's plan foretold in the OT and fulfilled in Jesus (e.g., Luke 1:1; 1:14–17, 31–35, 46–55, 68–79; 2:9–14, 30–32, 34–35; 4:16–30; 13:31–35; 24:44–49). The promises in the OT were made to the nation of Israel, and Luke presents Jesus as coming to restore the nation. Furthermore, Luke points to a widespread hope that God would fully restore the nation of Israel: "But we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel" (Luke 24:21, cf. Acts 1:6). This appears to be something akin to a hope of a "new exodus" or a "return from exile" for the nation.

Furthermore, David Pao has argued that Luke's overall narrative in Luke-Acts contains an Isaianic new exodus program.[17] At the very least, his work demonstrates that the "new exodus" of Isaiah is in view at critical junctures in the Gospel and thus influences Luke's presentation of Jesus.[18]

In further support for Wright's view, judgment in Luke is at times directed at Israel corporately for their sin and in particular for their rejection of Jesus (e.g., Luke 3:9; 10:13–16; 11:29–33; 11:46–52; 13:6–9; 13:34–35; 20:9–19; 21:24; 22:30).[19] Moreover, language commonly associated with salvation is used to refer to the hope of restoration for the nation as a whole (e.g., Luke 1:68; 2:25; 24:21).

However, Luke often speaks of judgment for individuals after death. Anyone who responds appropriately to Jesus can avoid being cast out to where there will be "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Luke 13:23–30) and enter to the final eschatological banquet (Luke 18:26–30). Jesus says, "But I will warn you whom to fear: fear him who, after he has killed, has authority to cast into hell" (γέενναν; Luke 12:5). This statement makes no sense apart from a real end-time judgment for individuals. Furthermore, when the Son of Man returns, all individuals will face judgment or avoid judgment based

---

[17] David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002).

[18] See Luke 3:4–6 (cf. Isa 40:3–5), Luke 4:18–19 (cf. Isa 61:1–2; Isa 58:6), and Luke 24:46–47 (cf. Isa 49:6).

[19] One of the conclusions from Pao's *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* is that Luke's narrative transforms Isaiah's new exodus theme with an ironic twist: though Isaiah 40 announced salvation for Israel, Israel has rejected Jesus and his "new exodus" and thus will be judged (Isa 6:9–10; cf. Acts 28:25–28).

on whether they sought to preserve their life or if they lost their life (Luke 17:30–35). The rich ruler desired to know what he must do to "inherit eternal life." Bock notes that Luke uniquely presents Jesus speaking of "personal eschatology."[20] In Luke 24:42–43, Jesus speaks of the thief on the cross as being aware of his presence after death (cf. Acts 7:55–56).

Bock aptly summarizes the Gospel's presentation of this theme: "Luke also underscores judgment by making the point that one is accountable to God. To ignore God's message leaves one exposed to the judgment Jesus will bring one day ([Luke] 11:50 –51; 12:20, 45–58, 57– 59; 13:1–9; 16:19–31; 17:26–37; Acts 10:42; 17:31)."[21] Jesus and his contemporaries were concerned with individual salvation as well as the restoration of Israel.[22]

Hence, while the "return from exile" theme is present in Luke's Gospel this theme does not rise to such level of prominence that it can serve as an all-encompassing definition for Jesus' teaching concerning repentance and forgiveness. The "return from exile's" national implications are more appropriately balanced when Jesus' teachings concerning judgment and salvation are considered. With the background material and these broader Lukan themes surveyed,

---

[20] Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994), p. 42.

[21] Darrell L. Bock, *A Theology of Luke and Acts: God's Promised Program, Realized for All Nations* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), p. 262.

[22] The point is that while Wright largely skips over the eternal implications for individual judgment, the Jesus of Luke (and all the other Gospels as well) does not. Craig Blomberg, "The Wright Stuff: A Critical Overview of Jesus and the Victory of God," in *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus & the Victory of God* (ed. Carey C. Newman; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999), p. 32, correctly critiques Wright on this point: "Where is the central narrative of Jesus' teaching ultimately headed? Wright concludes in chapter eight (*JVG*, pp. 320–68) that it leads to both judgment and vindication. Here he helpfully sets Jesus' narrative in the context of the Psalms, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Maccabean literature and Josephus, though interestingly there are hints of an afterlife in a different world in all of these books, of a kind that Wright apparently denies to Jesus' own teaching. In fact, he even admits that Jesus' view on hell may have 'wider implications' than just for this life; but he then alleges that those implications remain 'outside the scope' of this book (*JVG*, p. 323), though it is not at all clear why."

we are now ready to understand and evaluate Wright's interpretation of two parables related to repentance and forgiveness in Luke.

Two Parables Related to Repentance and Forgiveness

Luke 15:11–32

Luke 15:11–32 functions centrally in *JVG* as Wright argues that the parable tells the story of Israel's exile and restoration.[23] The traditional interpretation of the parable understands the characters in view of the context set in Luke 15:1–2 and accordingly sees the prodigal son representing the sinner, the older brother representing the self-righteous religious leadership, and the father picturing God. This view argues that the lesson of the parable is that, ". . . sinners are to come to God, and the righteous are to accept the sinner's decision to turn to Him. It is the father's reaction to the sons that is at the center of the parable. His response, in turn, instructs people on how they should respond."[24]

Though Wright himself admits that his reading of the parable is without precedent, he nonetheless is convinced that return from exile is the central theme. According to Wright, the exodus stories and the Babylonian captivity serve as the backdrop for the parable. The younger brother represents Israel who finds himself in exile: "What was Israel to do? Why, to repent of the sin which had driven her into exile, and to return to YHWH with all her heart."[25] According to Wright, those who grumble at Jesus' ministry are the "mixed multitude, not least the Samaritans, who had remained in the land while the people were in exile."[26] Jeremiah 31:18–20, which concerns both exile and repentance, refers to Israel as God's son and provides the OT textual background for the parable. Furthermore, for Wright, the references to resurrection in Luke 15:24 and 15:32 are metaphors for the return from exile.[27]

There are several problems with Wright's interpretation. First, it does not fit within Luke's context. The context of all three parables in chapter 15 is that tax collectors and sinners gathered around Jesus, and the Pharisees have grumbled concerning his association

---

[23] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, pp. 125–31; pp. 242, 254–55.

[24] Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53,* p. 1320.

[25] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 126.

[26] Ibid., p. 126.

[27] Ibid., pp. 125–31, 242, 254–55.

with these moral outcasts. The previous two parables have focused on repentance of individuals and correspond well with the traditional interpretation that this parable is defending the acceptance of tax collectors and sinners who have returned to the father.

Second, the justification for seeing Jer 31:18–20 as the basis for this parable is tenuous at best. Not every reference to a "son" in the Gospels is meant to serve as a reference to Israel, and there is nothing else in the passage that would call for seeing Jer 31:18–20 as the background. Moreover, if Jer 31:18–20 is not accepted as the basis, there is no other evidence for understanding the exodus or the Babylonian captivity as the background for the passage.

Finally, there is no credible evidence to support the claim that the elder brother represents the Samaritans who did not want Israel to be restored from exile. If this is what Jesus meant to symbolize with the elder brother in the parable, it is at odds with this Gospel as Luke presents Samaritans in a positive light (Luke 10:25–37; 17:11–19). The obvious parallel is the correct one: the elder brother represents the Pharisees who are grumbling about Jesus' ministry and listening to this parable.

In view of the lack of evidence to support Wright's reading, the traditional interpretation should stand, and it is no surprise that even those who are sympathetic to Wright's work have tended not to follow him on his understanding of this parable.[28]

Luke 16:19–21

The occurrence of μετανοήσουσιν in Luke 16:30 takes place within the context of the parable of the "Rich man and Lazarus" (Luke 16:19–31).[29] Although the word repentance is not seen until

---

[28] Snodgross Klyne R. Snodgrass, "Reading & Overreading the Parables in *Jesus and the Victory of God*," in *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus & the Victory of God* (ed. Carey C. Newman; Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1999), p. 70, is justified when he writes, "The theology of repentance and return operative in the parable is valid for Israel and was already in evidence in various writers such as Jeremiah. The parable of the prodigal, however, is not about us or Israel's return from exile. It is about two kinds of response to the kingdom forgiveness Jesus embodied: a repentance that leads to reconciliation and celebration, and irrational disdain, the result of which the parable leaves undetermined."

[29] Though some have preferred to call this an "example story" rather than a parable, it appears that the two categories are not easily distinguish-

the end of this story, the concept is present throughout. Wright summarizes his understanding of this parable:

> The other parable that stresses repentance is the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31). The story carries clear echoes of well-known folk-tales, to which Jesus is giving a fresh and startling twist. The emphasis falls at the same point that was made twice—i.e. with great stress—in the prodigal son: "resurrection," i.e. "return from exile," is happening all around, and the Pharisees cannot see it.[30]

For Wright, the parable is about what is happening in Israel's present. Moreover, Lazarus' welcome into Abraham's bosom parallels the acceptance of the prodigal by the father and was a sign of the "real return from exile," and the five brothers parallel the prodigal's elder brother.[31]

Wright's reading does not find much support in the immediate context of Luke. Since both men in the story die, it is difficult to read it as a story of Israel's present. There is no clear connection between any part of this story and exile, and no evidence for the parallels that he draws with the parable of the prodigal.

Again, Luke's context for this parable is significant. The audience is the Pharisees who Luke notes are "lovers of money" (Luke 16:14). Jesus has just accused them of being "those who justify yourselves before men" (Luke 16:15). The parable that follows is complex because it makes several points, with two being related to the concept of repentance. First, in view of the context (Luke 16:14), Jesus is calling the rich, in particular the Pharisees, to repent of their use of wealth as he tells of the rich man living lavishly while not appropriately caring for the poor (Luke 16:20–21, 25). Second, as seen in Luke 16:26–31, the parable teaches that repentance is not dependent on signs. Some will not "repent" (μετανοήσουσιν; Luke 16:30), even if someone returns from the

---

able. Blomberg refers to "example stories" as a subclass of parables. Whatever label is placed on the story, it appears to teach through using a real life hypothetical situation. For the purposes of this paper, this story will be referred to as a parable. For more discussion on this verse, see Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990), p. 73; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, p. 1126; Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, pp. 1362–63.

[30] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 255.

[31] Ibid., p. 255.

grave to deliver the message.[32] Marshall summarizes this point well: "[T]he law and prophets are insufficient to call the rich to repentance, even the return of someone resurrected from the dead will not achieve the desired effect. Miracles in themselves cannot melt stony hearts."[33] The call is for people to recognize in the present life the need for repentance.[34]

The Need to Emphasize "Both/And"

In concluding this survey of Jesus' call to repentance and forgiveness in these two Lukan parables, it is important note where we have been. By looking at the background material which helps us interpret the Gospels, it has been argued that Wright is fundamentally right to place Jesus' ministry within the framework of the hope within many first-century Jews who saw themselves as corporately, in some sense, still in exile with the expectation that the Lord would one day soon come to restore the nation. And indeed, with the background in view, it seems correct to affirm that repentance and forgiveness *at times* have corporate Israel primarily in view, rather than the traditional individual conversion sense of the terms. Yet Wright goes further than arguing that Jesus *at times* can use repentance and forgiveness of sins as primarily corporate and with the exile in view. According to Wright, "Forgiveness of sins is another way of saying 'return from exile.'"[35] And also, for Wright, when Jesus called for repentance he ". . . summoned Israel to a once-for-all national repentance, such as would be necessary for

---

[32] Bock also notes that the story is teaching an OT ethic and the finality of the afterlife based on the decisions made in this life. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, pp. 1360–61.

[33] Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 632.

[34] Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, p. 1378. This interpretation is in contrast to Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 291, who argues that Jesus' attitude toward the poor in this parable should be seen as a sign that Israel is returning from exile. The rich man corresponds to those "who seek a national or personal agenda for the restoration of land and property or ancestral rights."

[35] N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 268. Later he adds, "Forgiveness, in other words, is not simply one miscellaneous blessing, which will accompany covenant renewal. Since covenant renewal means the reversal of exile, and since exile was the punishment for sin, covenant renewal/return from exile *means* that Israel's sins have been forgiven—*and vice versa*" (emphasis mine; p. 269).

the exile to end at last,"[36] with repenting from nationalistic zeal primarily in view.

The problem occurs when the exile motif is run through all the individual narrative units and placed in the foreground, when there is no mention of Israel and eschatological corporate "forgiveness of sins" in the immediate context. When passages are approached this way, the background becomes the foreground. Despite Wright's claim that "there is, in fact, no tension, no play-off, between the personal and the corporate," there does at least seem to be a problem with what is being emphasized.[37]

Of all the Gospels, the individual and universal need for all people to repent of sin and find forgiveness is most evident in Luke. In fact, Wright seems to agree with this conclusion. Specifically, Wright's statement concerning the Gospel of Luke brings into focus certain methodological issues in interpreting Jesus' message:

> That Luke is particularly interested in it [repentance], as witnessed by two passages in which he mentions repentance while the parallel passage does not (5:32; 15:7: see below), is no good reason for denying that it formed part of Jesus' preaching; Luke may conceivably have thought of it in a less "eschatological" and more "moral" fashion, but this does not remove it from Jesus' announcement. The following passages indicate *prima facie,* that Jesus was indeed summoning his hearers to a great turning, that is, not just to an individual moral repentance, but to an eschatological act which would prove the only way to escape eschatological judgment.[38]

Wright admits Luke is particularly interested in repentance in more the "moral" sense of the term. The pertinent question is: if Wright acknowledges that Luke and Jesus himself were calling people to *both* an individual moral repentance and to the corporate repentance from nationalistic zeal and the end of the exile, what causes him to downplay the former and emphasize the latter in his definitions of the terms and at times in his interpretation (see two examples above)? To this question, we now turn as we have dug far enough to conclude by gleaning four hermeneutical lessons from this test case.

---

[36] Ibid., p. 251.

[37] Ibid., p. 272.

[38] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 252.

Hermeneutical Lessons

First, we must be careful to not "over-systematize" the biblical data. In this case, Wright appears to have over-focused on the "return from exile" in understanding what Jesus meant by repentance and forgiveness.[39] Often, systematic theology texts are accused of defining concepts, in this case repentance and forgiveness, without carefully noting how the concepts are used differently at various points within salvation history.[40] For example, rather than asking, what does the term "repentance" mean for Jesus in his context within salvation history, often contemporary theologians can be guilty of simply bypassing the temporal question in favor of the atemporal question of what does the term mean in the whole Bible, which might be different, or at least have different emphases and nuances in different biblical books. Undoubtedly, this lack of attention to salvation history is in part due to the differences between the disciplines of biblical and systematic theology, yet this occurrence is not limited to systematic texts.[41] The failure to recognize

---

[39] Richard B. Hays, "Knowing Jesus: Story, History, and the Question of Truth" in *Jesus, Paul, and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N. T. Wright* (ed. Nicholas Perrin and Richard B. Hays; Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), p. 55, points to Wright as an example of what he labels as "over-systematization": "The question that haunts many readers of *JVG* is whether Tom's synthetic construct is too clever by half, whether it obsessively forces all the evidence into a single mode of exile and return pattern."

[40] For example, see Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), p. 709. Repentance is explained in the context of individual conversion: "The word *conversion* itself means 'turning'—here it represents a spiritual turn, a turning *from* sin *to* Christ. The turning from sin is called repentance, and the turning to Christ is called *faith*." Most other standard Christian theology texts explain repentance and forgiveness as they relate to individual conversion. For more examples, see Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), pp. 480–509; Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998), pp. 933–42.

[41] For example, J. Lunde, "Repentance," *DJG*, p. 669 writes, "Repentance in the Gospels refers to the radical 'turning away' from anything which hinders one's wholehearted trust in God." For an example in regards to forgiveness, see P. Ellingworth, "Forgiveness of Sin," *DJG*, pp. 241–43. Though Ellingworth mentions the national corporate forgiveness in the OT, he does not connect this OT emphasis to the way Jesus' mes-

such distinctions seems to be in part why Wright critiques the "traditional" definitions of repentance and forgiveness.[42] Wright's argument against the traditional definitions should alert theologians of how concepts are often used differently within the canon and within different stages of salvation history. In this way, Wright can help theologians avoid an overly narrow definition of "repentance" and "forgiveness" that does not pay close attention to the context for concepts within the different stages in salvation history and the different parts of the canon.

On the other hand, one of the dangers of Wright's storyline approach to biblical theology is that, while helpful in many ways, it runs the risk of privileging a particular theologian's self-constructed framework onto the text.[43] The present study has offered an exam-

---

sage has been understood by those who stress the restoration of Israel as central to Jesus' message. For more on the definitions and the relationship between biblical and systematic theology, see D.A. Carson, "Systematic and Biblical Theology," *NDBT,* pp. 89–104.

[42] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 268.

[43] Andreas Köstenberger, "The Present and Future of Biblical Theology," *Themelios* 37 (2012): p. 459, writes concerning Wright and his approach to Biblical Theology, saying: "Evangelicals such as Beale believe that it is every word of Scripture that is inspired, not merely the biblical storyline. If so, what in practice helps us to avoid privileging the biblical storyline (as construed by us) to the extent that less prominent portions of Scripture are unduly neglected? Here we must take care not to be similar in practice (though not in theory) to the approach of scholars such as N.T. Wright (not an inerrantist) in his work *The Last Word* or German content criticism, which has also had a notable impact on the work of some British and other evangelicals. Some recent works are more rigorously inductive while others proceed from a systematic or confessional framework in exploring the teachings of Scripture. Also, the specific proposals made by various scholars differ as to what the theology of the Bible actually is and how it coheres. In part, this is a matter of setting different emphases or privileging a particular overall framework, whether the glory of God, eschatology, salvation history, or some other central topic, not to mention the importance of hermeneutics." For more on Wright's overall method, see the chapter entitled "Biblical Theology As Worldview-Story: N.T. Wright" by Klink and Lockett in Edward W. Klink III and Darian R. Lockett, *Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), pp. 109–24. Klink and Lockett comment, "What sets Wright's approach apart from the 'tunnel vision' of modern NT scholarship is his ability to set a particular passage into the

ple of how Wright's storyline approach itself can result in "over-systematization." Instead of allowing the immediate context of verses that include the concepts of repentance and forgiveness to take priority, Wright often focuses on broader background considerations. While the exile, with its national implications, is found in each Gospel, it is a mistake to understand this theme as the main point of many texts related to repentance and forgiveness. Hence, when "exile," a theme that is present but not as pervasive as Wright suggests, is made the central overarching theme in defining repentance and forgiveness, unbalanced and overly narrow definitions emerge.

Second, synthesizing the three Synoptic Gospels can cause the voices of the particular Gospel writers to be muffled.[44] While Wright sees all the Synoptics as supporting his definitions of repentance, he admits that in Luke, Jesus is portrayed as using the term repentance in more of the "moral" sense of the term.[45] It could be argued that in different ways each Gospel calls into question Wright's definitions as too narrow and his interpretations as overly emphasizing the corporate aspects of forgiveness and repentance. However, if Wright had avoided synthesizing the Synoptics into one narrative as he explored these concepts, Luke's more "moral" emphasis would have been difficult to downplay in his description of Jesus' proclamation of repentance.

Third, those who seek to reconstruct a "historical Jesus" and maintain the historical reliability of the canonical Gospels must be careful not to make sharp distinctions between a particular evangelists' portrait and the historical Jesus. Luke presents Jesus—

---

larger framework of early Christian origins. Like the backdrop on a movie set, the 'story' or larger worldview is the crucial setting within which the action of the NT unfolds. In order for one to understand what Jesus and Paul is doing in the scene, one must frame the action within the correct context" (p. 110). In agreement with their assessment, Wright's ability to cast a believable overarching storyline does appear to be one of Wright's strengths, but, perhaps, like often occurs in life, one's greatest strength can also be one's greatest weakness. In sticking with Klink's and Lockett's analogy, this paper suggests that for Wright one of the *various* biblical plots (i.e., "return from exile") has been mistakenly viewed as *the* central storyline for which every scene related to forgiveness and repentance is to be understood.

[44] Hays, "Knowing Jesus," p. 55.

[45] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, p. 252.

according to Wright—as using the term "repentance" in more of the moral sense than in Jesus' "actual" ministry. At this point, Wright appears to make a distinction between the historical and canonical Jesus.[46] Implicitly, it seems that whereas Luke highlights the "moral" and "individual" sense of repentance, Wright's reconstruction of Jesus takes priority over Luke's portrait.

Finally, extra-biblical literature is important in view of the historic nature of the Gospels, but this materially can be easily misused. Even those paying close attention to the historical context can get off course by offering an insufficiently nuanced perspective. Moreover, a further danger exists in allowing extra-biblical material to overshadow the biblical text. Wright has reminded interpreters of the importance of placing Jesus firmly in the context of first century Judaism and displays an exceptional overall grasp of Second Temple literature. Yet, this article has argued that the background material is less monolithic than Wright suggests.

[46] Ibid.

STR 5/2 (Winter 2014) 203–31

A Return to Christ's Kingdom: Early Swiss Anabaptist Understanding and Temporal Application of the Kingdom of God

Stephen Brett Eccher
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Introduction

Jesus spoke often about the Kingdom of God as a part of His preaching ministry. Since His first century proclamations about Kingdom the idea has historically been interpreted in a variety of ways and applied in a host of divergent contexts.[1] The Kingdom of God served a prominent place in Eusebius of Caesarea's link between Emperor Constantine and the "Son of Man" designation from Daniel 7, was foundational to Augustine's *City of God*, and was even an impetus to Thomas Müntzer's radical call for the destruction of the godless during the German Peasants' War. Given the importance of this biblical phrase and subsequent confusion surrounding its meaning throughout history, the following will seek to identify its development in the early Swiss Anabaptists' answer to the question, "what is the Kingdom of God?"[2] By exploring the future Anabaptists' thoughts during Zürich's embrace of the Reformation in the early 1520s until the *Schleitheim Confession* of 1527, this exercise will present the Anabaptists' newly formed view of Kingdom amid their break from the Swiss Church. By 1527 the Anabaptists' view of Kingdom led them away from the territorial church model. Filling the vacuum left by their abrogation of a state church model, their new ecclesiology culminated in something different. Theirs was a church rooted in a kingdom dichotomy, was

[1] For a presentation of the historic models of Kingdom see Benedict T. Viviano, *The Kingdom of God in History* (Wilmington: Michael Glazer, 1988).

[2] The label "Swiss Anabaptist" is quite loaded and has been used to describe a plurality of people and movements. For this essay the designation will be used within one context unless otherwise noted. It will refer to those individuals who operated in or near Zürich and utilized believers' baptism as the entry point into a confessing, gathered church composed exclusively of regenerate believers.

assembled on the basis of regeneration, and intently disciplined given the temporal church's relationship with the eternal one in heaven.

By 1524 Huldrych Zwingli, the reformer of Zürich, had come to a stark realization about his former friends and students. His estranged followers, Conrad Grebel and Felix Manz, had leveraged the controversial and volatile issue of infant baptism as a means to realize an entirely "new church."[3] What these future Anabaptists were doing was out of step with the era and Zwingli knew it. However, exactly what this meant for the group that was to later become the Swiss Brethren was not yet fully in focus.[4] Zwingli's claim that his followers were founding a new church proved prophetic less than a year later when Grebel and Manz joined in the adult baptism of George Blaurock and what would later be identified as the recapturing of a believers' church.[5] Whether these men were aware of the ramifications of such action remains debatable. What

---

[3] Emil Egli, et al. (eds.), *Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke* (Berlin: Schwetschke und Sohn, 1905-), Band IV p. 207 and Claus-Peter Clasen, *Anabaptism: A Social History, 1525–1618* (London: Cornell University Press, 1972), p. 5.

[4] Consensus regarding the origin of the Swiss Brethren has proven elusive. Several historians have argued the movement had purely religious motives born amid the belief that Zwingli's reform efforts had not gone far enough. See Harold S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel c. 1498–1526: The Founder of the Swiss Brethren Sometimes Called Anabaptists* (Scottdale: Herald Press, 1950) and John H. Yoder, "The Turning Point in the Zwinglian Reformation," *MQR* 32 (1958), pp. 128–40. Other historians have contended that economic and social concerns dictated the group's departure from the magisterial Reformation in Zürich. See C. Arnold Snyder, "Revolution and the Swiss Brethren: The Case of Michael Sattler," *Church History* 50 (1981), pp. 276–87 and James M. Stayer, "Die Anfänge des schweizerischen Täufertums," in *Umstrittenes Täufertums* (ed. Hans Jürgen-Goertz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1977), pp. 19–49; idem, "The Swiss Brethren: An Exercise in Historical Definition," *Church History* 47 (1978), pp. 175–98; idem "Reublin and Brötli: The Revolutionary Beginnings of Swiss Anabaptism," in *The Origins and Characteristics of Anabaptism / Les Debuts et les Characteristiques de l'Anabaptisme* (ed. Marc Lien; The Hague: Springer, 1977), pp. 83–102.

[5] For a first-hand account of this baptism see AJF Zieglschmid (ed.), *Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder* (Ithaca: Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, 1943), pp. 45–47 and George H. Williams (ed.), *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957), pp. 42–44.

was clear is that through this one simple act a different concept of the church than Zwingli had envisioned was now a reality.

Naturally, this move towards the establishment of the Free Church had a profound impact on the Anabaptists.[6] One implication was the group's newly emerging perception of the temporal application of the Kingdom of God. As the movement set itself outside the bounds of the *corpus Christianum*, a reassessment of Kingdom became inevitable. As will be demonstrated, this alternate understanding of the nature of God's Kingdom than found in Zürich would intersect with many foundational facets of the Swiss Anabaptists' theology, specifically in their developing ecclesiology and soteriology.

The Phrase "Kingdom of God" in the Sources

Before proceeding any further a brief word about phraseology is in order. The Swiss Anabaptists did not speak regularly through the phrase Kingdom of God or any similar derivatives. That is not to say that Kingdom language was absent in the sources from the movement in those early years, for it is present.[7] Still, the sparse

---

[6] For a survey of the origins of the Free Church see Chapter One of Donald F. Durnbaugh, *The Believers' Church: The History and Character of Radical Protestantism* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968). Fritz Blanke has argued that Conrad Grebel's 1524 letter to Thomas Müntzer stood as "*die älteste Urkunde protestantischen Freikirchentums*" (the oldest source for the Protestant free-church model). Fritz Blanke, *Brüder in Christo: Die Geschichte der ältesten Täufergemeinde* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1955), p. 15. However, Jürgen-Goertz is correct to question such an early date when stating "the (Müntzer) letter failed to set out an ecclesiological program… nor did it contain any suggestion that Thomas Müntzer should abandon his popular-church activities in Allsteadt and restrict him to a free-church model." Hans Jürgen-Goertz, *The Anabaptists* (trans. Trevor Johnson; London: Routledge, 1996), p. 87.

[7] For a movement that had such a strong New Testament orientation and used Jesus' Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7) as both hermeneutical priority and a lens to understand all of Scripture, Kingdom language would always be present. Werner O. Packull, *Hutterite Beginnings: Communitarian Experiments during the Reformation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1995), pp. 28–30 and John D. Roth, "Harmonizing the Scriptures: Swiss Brethren understandings of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments during the last half of the sixteenth century," in *Radical Reformation*

usage of this phrasing should not be surprising given two important contextual realities. First, the Anabaptists were in agreement with the Swiss reformers regarding the future eschatological hope of heaven that was wrapped up in the language of Kingdom. The lack of deviation on this point is supported by their silence on the matter; there was no need to address theological points of agreement.[8] This is why issues like the Trinity were not addressed as the Anabaptists codified their beliefs at Schleitheim, for there was a preceding accord on such matters.[9] Second, given that the Anabaptists' theology developed within the contextual framework of the movement's departure from the Swiss territorial Church, the bulk of their writings were concerned with the pressing matter of establishing a church they argued was founded on the model seen in the New Testament. As will be demonstrated, this left the Swiss Anabaptists' usage of Kingdom language dictated by their emerging separatist convictions and embodied primarily in their developing soteriology and ecclesiology.

Thus, while the specific language of Kingdom may be used only sparingly in the sources, the concept was still deeply embedded in the Anabaptists' theology. As the Anabaptists' attention turned to the proper manifestation of the church in light of their altering ecclesiology, a focus on the temporal Kingdom in their contemporary context dominated their writings.[10] Vetting a new ecclesiology apart

---

Studies: Essays Presented to James M. Stayer (ed. Werner Packull and Geoffrey Dipple; Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 36–40.

[8] The main exception and point of derivation rested in the Anabaptist's emerging theology of martyrdom, which was directly facilitated by the illegal status of Anabaptism and linked to the group's eschatological focus. For the importance of martyrdom in Anabaptist theology see Ethelbert Stauffer, "Anabaptist Theology of Martyrdom," *MQR* 19 (1945), pp. 179–214; idem, "Täufertum und Märtyrertheologie," *Zeitschrift fur Kirchengeschichte* 3 (1933), pp. 545–98 and Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), pp.197–249.

[9] Schleitheim covered issues that the Anabaptists and Swiss state Church disagreed on including baptism, the ban, the Supper, separation from the world, support for pastors, civil authorities, and the use of oaths. "The Schleitheim Confession" in *The Legacy of Michael Sattler* (trans. and ed. John H. Yoder; Scottdale: Herald Press, 1973), pp. 34–43.

[10] The modern way of demarcating this distinction in time is based in an already/not yet view of Kingdom. For details on this model of King-

from Zwingli's demanded the group focus on the present manifestation of God's Kingdom in the temporal realm. Therefore, as this essay will demonstrate, the focus on Kingdom for these Anabaptists was connected with their embrace of a gathered, believers' church. To rightly understand the Anabaptists' reclamation of a believers' church one must return to the early 1520s, to a time when these future Anabaptists were still in lockstep with Zwingli.

The Decidedly "Non-Territorial" Kingdom

Given the splintering division that was a consequence of the Protestant Reformation, one of the fundamental questions raised during the early modern period was "who is the true church?" This applied to the controversy between Martin Luther and the Roman Catholic Church. It was also a serious question debated between the early Anabaptists and their Swiss magisterial counterparts.[11] Attempts to find the "true church" amid the fragmentation of the Reformation begged a subsequent question regarding the initial departure from truth. The question of the "fall of the church" became an equally important point of emphasis. Identification of the earlier problem of the church's "fall" would inform the solution to the larger overarching question regarding the proper form of the "true" church.

The Swiss Anabaptists did not come to their separatist Free Church position all at once, nor to their new understanding of Kingdom that will be outlined shortly. In fact, almost all initial attempts at reform made by the future Swiss Anabaptists took place within the Swiss territorial Church. This is often all too easily forgotten about the leaders of the Anabaptist movement. During the early to mid-1520s serious attempts were made by reformers like James Brötli, Conrad Grebel, Balthasar Hubmaier, and Wilhelm

---

dom, or what Viviano calls the "ecclesial school" see Viviano, pp. 31, 51–56. A helpful overview of the historiography related to this tension may be found in George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), pp. 54–67 and Russell D. Moore, *The Kingdom of Christ: The New Evangelical Perspective* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2004), pp. 36–52.

[11] This was a major consideration at the Bernese disputations of 1532 and 1538. Martin Haas (ed.), *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz*, Band IV; Drei Täufergespräche (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1974), pp. 94 and 313.

Reublin to realize territorial forms of Anabaptism.[12] Most of these were caught up in the flood of Reformation impulse that swept through the Swiss Confederation and their voices of concern echoed alongside reformers who would maintain magisterial Reformations, including reformers like Zwingli, Heinrich Bullinger, Martin Bucer, and Johannes Oecolampadius.

How then did these future Anabaptists come to reject the Constantinian state Church model that eventually necessitated their separation from the Swiss Church? The answer to that important question was what moved the group to consider a reassessment of their idea of Kingdom from a temporal perspective. The civil magistrates' authority, especially in ecclesiastical matters, played a critical role here. Each of the magisterial reformers noted above chose to pursue Reformation in the Swiss Church through the authority of the civil magistrates. By as early as 1523 this was a conviction eschewed by the future Swiss Anabaptists.[13] Once that belief became a part of the future Swiss Anabaptists' narrative of dissent the first wave of persecutions ensued. Amid a growing persecution linked with the accusations of heresy and sedition, these future Anabaptists were forced to reassess their ecclesiology. This ecclesiological detour necessitated a form of the church outside of the previously established magisterial channels.[14] They tried to reform the church from within. However, once that option was removed a departure from the Swiss Church became inevitable. Here, the con-

---

[12] Stayer, "The Swiss Brethren," pp. 183–85 and Clasen, p. 2–5; 10. Snyder has contended, "the fact that the Anabaptist movement eventually failed as a popular movement in northern Switzerland should not be allowed to obscure the fact that a serious attempt was made to establish Anabaptism on a territorial 'church' model." Arnold Snyder, "The Monastic Origins of Swiss Anabaptism Sectarianism," *MQR* 57 (1983), p. 7.

[13] John H. Yoder, Anabaptism and Reformation in Switzerland: An Historical and Theological Analysis of the Dialogues Between Anabaptists and Reformers (ed. C. Arnold Snyder; Kitchener: Pandora Press, 2004), pp. 11–17.

[14] Calvin Pater astutely argues, "Grebel naturally prefers to be a part of a mass movement that will lead to reformation. When the majority proves 'weak,' Grebel insists on a biblically determined theocracy that proceeds without tarrying. When these preferred options fail, he becomes a separatist." Calvin Augustine Pater, *Karlstadt as the Father of Baptist Movements: The Emergence of Lay Protestantism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), p. 137.

text of persecution not only served as a catalyst to the Anabaptists' embrace of separatism, but it also facilitated their belief that the fall of the church took place with the wedding of the church and state in the fourth century.[15]

Identifying the Constantinian state Church as the initial point of departure from the "true church" served to highlight the fact that the present, temporal manifestation of Kingdom, embodied in the local church, could not be territorial. Such a conviction harkened back to one of the first seeds of division between the future Anabaptists and Zwingli—the relegation of the pace of reform to the civil magistrates. During the Second Zürich Disputation (Oct. 26–28, 1523) Zwingli argued that God's Word alone provided the theological foundation for reforms like the removal of images in the church and the abolishment of the Mass. Still, the Zürich authorities were the final governing body that would determine the practical removal of such things from the liturgy.[16] Simon Stumpf immediately rebutted Zwingli's understanding when he cried out, "Master Huldrych! You have no authority to place the decision in Milords' hands, for the decision is already made: the Spirit of God decides. If therefore Milords were to discern and decide anything that is contrary to God's decision, I will ask Christ for his Spirit and will teach and act against it."[17]

Conrad Grebel, one of those closest to Zwingli, was so incensed with his mentor's acquiescence to the civil authorities during this 1523 disputation that shortly thereafter he exclaimed, "Whoever thinks, believes, or declares that Zwingli acts according to the duty of a shepherd thinks, believes, and declares wickedly."[18] By 1523 the link between the Swiss Church and the civil authorities started serving as a vivid reminder to Grebel and others of precisely what was wrong with the Reformation in Zürich. As Neil Blough reasons,

---

[15] Franklin H. Littell, *The Anabaptist View of the Church: A Study in the Origins of Sectarian Protestantism* (Paris: The Baptist Standard Bearer, 1958), pp. 46–78.

[16] "The Second Zurich Disputation" in *The Sources of Swiss Anabaptism* (ed. Leland Harder; Scottdale: Herald Press, 1985), pp. 242–43.

[17] Ibid., p. 242.

[18] "The Grebel-Stumpf Alternative Plan of a Separatist Church" in Harder, pp. 276.

> In Anabaptist eyes this was merely a repeat of what had already begun in the fourth century and had continued throughout the ensuing centuries, i.e., the creation of a 'Christendom' in which there was all too little difference between the church and the world, where earthly empires or kingdoms were all too closely identified with the kingdom of Christ, where the millennium became reality within the *corpus Christianum*.[19]

Driven by a desire to return to the church they saw in the New Testament, as well as by the contextually forced move toward separatism, the Anabaptists sought to gather a church loosed the civil authorities and based on confessing voluntarism. "They contrasted the *corpus Christianum* with the Body of Christ and, against an empire under the joint sway of the clergy and the princes, they counterposed the New Kingdom, where Christ would reign through the members of his body."[20] Thus, God's Kingdom was manifest in the present temporal sense through the gathered body of regenerate believers, not the territorial church.

Kingdom Dichotomy

Perhaps in no greater way was this newly forming view of the temporal Kingdom manifested than in the Swiss Anabaptists' embrace of a two-kingdom duality. As the group continued to explore a church loosed the entanglement of the state, a separation between the disparate contexts of a new vision of the church and anything outside of it surfaced. Eventually this separatism or what Robert Friedman classified as "the doctrine of two worlds" became solidified as a foundational tenet of the movement at Schleitheim in 1527.[21]

However, even before Schleitheim, a number of sources provide a window of insight into the emergence of this two-kingdom ideology. Recalling the first adult baptisms in Zürich on January 25, 1525 George Blaurock concluded with the bold declaration,

---

[19] Neal Blough, "Introduction," in Yoder, *Anabaptism and Reformation in Switzerland*, p. liii.

[20] Jürgen-Goertz, *The Anabaptists*, p. 85.

[21] Robert Friedmann, "The Doctrine of the Two Worlds" in *The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision* (ed. Guy F. Hershberger; Paris: The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc., 1957), pp. 105–18. Despite the fact that Friedmann overstated the importance of this kingdom dichotomy in Anabaptist theology, it was an important corollary of larger, more dominant tenets.

"Therewith began the separation from the world and its evil works."[22] The dichotomy of the Anabaptists' recovery of the "true church" against the implied territorial manifestation was employed as a summarizing point of emphasis here and linked to the act of believers' baptism. Nevertheless, one must remember that this reminiscence was a part of the larger corpus known as the *Hutterite Chronicle*. Therefore, it is difficult to know if the realization of this two-kingdom view was fully discernable to Blaurock in 1525 or if it was a later editorial addition during the documents' inclusion in the work.

An equally important and yet just as potentially biased source came from the pen of Zwingli in his *Elenchus*. Relaying the Anabaptist's arguments for a form of the church sometime after the Second Zürich disputation but prior to December 1523, Zwingli recorded the plan of Conrad Grebel and Simon Stumpf:

> It does not escape us that there will ever be those who will oppose the gospel, even among those who boast in the name of Christ. We therefore can never hope that all minds will so unite as Christians should find it possible to live. For in the Acts of the Apostles those who had believed seceded from the others, and then it happened that they who came to believe went over to those who were now a new church.[23]

The phrase "opposition to the gospel" clarified just how crucial this idea was to the Anabaptists going back to the overarching Reformation search for the true church. It also spoke to the group's veiled accusation against Zwingli shortly after he relegated the pace of reform to the magistrates. The disunity mentioned appears a concession to the reality of two views of authority: the Swiss Anabaptists submitting exclusively to the Word of God and the Swiss Reformers at least partially to the magistrates. The logical corollary for this became a contextually driven abandonment of any territorial form of Anabaptism. Therefore, the temporal application of Kingdom was linked with the regenerate, gathered church. The unspecified reference to Luke's *Acts of the Apostles* ostensibly referred to the establishment of the Christian Church apart from Ju-

---

[22] "The Beginnings of the Anabaptist Reformation Reminiscences of George Blaurock: An Excerpt from the Hutterite Chronicle 1525" in Williams, *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers*, p. 44.

[23] "Refutation of the Tricks of the Baptists" in *Ulrich Zwingli (1484–1531): Selected Works* (ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), p. 132.

daism following Pentecost. In that biblical instance the separation of a regenerate church of confessing believers in Jesus was distinguished from the theocracy of Israel, specifically from those who denied Christ. For the Anabaptists, this demarcation demanded the same for their church, only the context had changed.

Again, since this statement from Grebel and/or Simon Stumpf is available only through Zwingli, there remain questions about the historical reliability of the words, especially given the polemical nature of His *Elenchus*. Nevertheless, at least two things suggest a high level of reliability to the statement. First, since this was conveyed shortly after the Second Zürich Disputation, the notion of separatism and a kingdom dichotomy must have at least been a consideration of these future Anabaptists as implied in their disdain for Zwingli's position. Second, this notion of separation was similar to Felix Manz's requirement that confessing followers of Jesus be "gathered" out from society; a statement made during his interrogation in December 1526 or January 1527.[24]

If the aforementioned examples indicate a late 1523 or early 1524 emergence of a kingdom dichotomy, then the writings of Michael Sattler helped further embed this dualism into Anabaptist theology a couple years later. This was an idea that surfaced in Sattler's thought as early as 1526. After outlining convictions regarding regenerate church membership in a letter to the reformers of Strasbourg, Martin Bucer and Wolfgang Capito, Sattler proceeded to set forth a kingdom dichotomy when he argued,

> Christ is despised in the world. So are also those who are His; He has no kingdom in the world, but that which is of this world is against His kingdom. Believers are chosen out of the world, therefore the world hates them. The devil is prince over the whole world, in whom all the children of darkness rule. Christ is the Prince of the Spirit, in whom all who walk in the light live… The citizenship of Christians is in heaven and not on earth. Christians are the members of the household of God and fellow citizens of the saints, and

[24] "Verhör von Manz und Blaurock" in *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz*, Erster Band (ed. Leonhard von Muralt; Zürich: Hirzel Verlag, 1952), p. 216.

> not of the world… In sum: There is nothing in common between Christ and Belial.[25]

Using binary, dualistic language Sattler argued for an ontological distinction between the two disparate realities of Christ's Kingdom, of which regenerate believers were members, and the realm ruled by Satan known as "the world." These were two irreconcilable kingdoms, mutually exclusive in relation to personal membership. To follow Christ meant participation in His Kingdom alone. This, in turn, necessitated forfeiture of any other form.

What was a concern in contrast to the convictions held by Bucer and Capito became codified into Swiss Anabaptist doctrine at Schleitheim in 1527.[26] Drawing on the ideas and language previously employed in his letter to the Strasbourg reformers, Sattler further highlighted the importance of this two-kingdom theology in his famous *Schleitheim Confession*.[27] The idea of separation was a dominant them from the outset of the work and even appeared in the cover letter to the document, which declared, "we have been united to stand fast in the Lord as obedient children of God, sons and daughters, who have been and shall be separated from the world in all the we do and leave undone."[28]

Sattler's kingdom dualism eventually climaxed in the Fourth Article of the *Schleitheim Confession*:

> We have been united concerning the separation that shall take place from the evil and the wickedness which the devil has planted in the world, simply in this; that we have no fellowship with them, and do not run with them in the confusion of their abominations…Now there is nothing else in the world and all creation than good or evil, believing and unbelieving, darkness and light, the world and those who are [come] out of the world, God's temple and idols, Christ and Belial, and none will have part with the other.[29]

This two-kingdoms conviction was so critical to the beliefs of those Anabaptists at Schleitheim that, as Gerald Biesecker-Mast has

---

[25] "Parting with the Strasbourg Reformers" in *Legacy of Michael Sattler*, p. 22.

[26] John Yoder has famously referred to this as the "crystallization point of Anabaptism." John H. Yoder, "Der Kristallisationspunkt des Täufertums," *Mennonitische Geschictsblätter* 24 (1972), pp. 35–47.

[27] "The Schleitheim Brotherly Union," pp. 34–43.

[28] Ibid., p. 35.

[29] Ibid., pp. 37–38.

explained, "this call to separation is the framework within which nearly all of the remaining articles establish their distinctive formulas for the Christian practice of the Swiss Brethren and within which appeals to unity are made throughout the document."[30] The repeated usage of various forms of the German verb for "separation" (*absondern*) afforded Sattler the medium to emphasize that affiliation with Christ via regeneration necessitated disassociation with those things outside of the church.[31] Discordant categories such as "good and evil" (*Gutes und Böses*), "darkenss and light" (*Finsternis und Licht*), and "servitude of the flesh [and] service for God and the Spirit (*Dienstbarkeit des Fleisches* [and] *Dienst Gottes durch den Geist*) became the means of demarcating Christ's Kingdom from anything outside of it.[32] Therefore, as new believers participated in God's Kingdom, these were simultaneously required to disassociate with the world. Their new ontological reality of being adopted as children of the King demanded as much.

Without question the contextual circumstances of being forced to establish a church outside a territorial form played a role in this shift towards a dichotomist view of the temporal Kingdom. That reality surfaced following the Second Zürich Disputation and especially as persecution of the movement grew over time. However, arguably just as important to the emergence of this idea was the Swiss Anabaptists' growing dependence upon a New Testament orientation and hermeneutic that placed a focus on the ethical teachings of Jesus in the gospel accounts. Here, the words of Christ served as the practical guide for what the authentic form of God's Kingdom in the temporal realm was to look like.

The New Testament orientation of the Swiss Anabaptists was undoubtedly a by-product of their previous dealings with Zwingli. After all, Zwingli had instilled this in men like Grebel and Manz as they all labored for the Reformation of the Zürich Church prior to

---

[30] Gerald Biesecker-Mast, *Separation and the Sword in Anabaptist Persuasion: Radical Confessional Rhetoric from Schleitheim to Dordrecht* (Telford: Cascadia Publishing House, 2006), p. 102.

[31] Multiple cases of this usage may be found in "Brüderliche Vereinigung etlicher Kinder Gottes Artikel und Handlung" in *Der linke Flügel der Reformation: Glaubenszeugnisse der Täufer, Spiritualisten, Schwärmer und Antitrinitarier* (ed. Heinold Fast; Bremen: Carl Schünemann Verlag, 1962), pp. 61–62 and 64–65.

[32] Ibid., p. 64. English translations from "The Schleitheim Brotherly Union," p. 38.

their departure from it.[33] Although the group would not verbally abrogate the authority of the New Testament, as evidenced by Grebel's famous 1524 letter to Thomas Müntzer and Hans Krüsi's 1525 interrogation testimony, the words of Jesus in the Gospel accounts did provide the Swiss Anabaptists with a blueprint for the realization of their emerging view of the church.[34] Werner Packull has summarized this conviction as follows:

> The New Testament emphasis arose out of the simple assumption that Christ constituted the final and full revelation of God's will to humankind. Any serious desire to follow Christ's example and heed his teachings would obviously lead to the New Testament. The way of Christ as a 'hermeneutic formula' explains not only the New Testament orientation and selectivity toward the Old Testament but also the importance of the Sermon on the Mount and the sayings of Jesus within the New Testament. In this view an ethical epistemology determined the hermeneutical starting point.[35]

With focus placed on Jesus' words, specifically on the Sermon on the Mount, the Swiss Anabaptists took from Christ an ethically driven view of Kingdom that forced their dichotomist way of thinking. In the end, this ethical soteriology was a dramatically different way of thinking about the Kingdom of God, especially given the dominance of a territorial model for a millennium. However, one thing still remained: distinguishing with certainty those who

---

[33] John Roth has contended that the Swiss Anabaptist's strong New Testament orientation was based on a "Christocentric approach to ethics." Roth, "Harmonizing the Scriptures," p. 38. Hans Jürgen-Goertz has argued that the Swiss Anabaptist's strong New Testament orientation was a consequence of and a reaction to Zwingli's investment in the Old Testament beginning in 1525. Goertz, *The Anabaptists*, pp. 51–52. As the author of this article has previously argued, both arguments are valid, however, a timing element is critical in this. A "residual lean toward the New Testament" was a consequence of the group's earlier dealings with Zwingli. This then became further solidified given the contextual reality of Zwingli's stronger reach back to the Old Testament. Thus, both Roth and Goertz's convictions are valid, but dictated by the timing. Stephen Brett Eccher, *The Bernese Disputations of 1532 and 1538: A Historical and Theological Analysis* (The University of St. Andrews PhD Dissertation; St. Andrews, 2011), pp. 73–77.

[34] Roth, "Harmonizing the Scriptures," p. 38.

[35] Packull, *Hutterite Beginnings*, p. 17.

were genuinely regenerate from those that were not. Answering this question brought into fuller view their developing view of the Kingdom.

The Spotless Bride of Christ as Kingdom

Establishing a regenerate church in theory is one thing; realizing it in practice is something different. For Huldrych Zwingli such was a non-issue. In his arguments against the Roman Catholic apologist Jerome Emser, Zwingli made clear that the church gathered in a pre-glorified era was not a regenerate body. Drawing on both Israel's history and the same biblical parables once employed by Augustine to argue for a *corpus permixtum*, Zwingli contended, "You see that in the Old Testament as well as in the New the church was composed of the faithful and of those who were unfaithful but pretended faith, and therefore was not yet such that neither wrinkle nor spot attached to it."[36] Zwingli and the other Swiss magisterial reformers believed that the Anabaptists' proposed believers' church was thoroughly presumptive, for there was an anonymous element to any form of the gathered, visible church prior to glorification.[37]

The Swiss Anabaptists contended that the practical realization of a believers' church was not only found in the commands of Scripture, but was actually quite simple; as Jesus had stated, "you will recognize them by their fruits."[38] What made such a church possible was a different soteriological construct from the one Zwingli and the other magisterial reformers held. As the Swiss Anabaptists' view of salvation came into focus their picture of God's Kingdom prior to the return of Christ emerged. Most magisterial reformers followed Martin Luther's lead by affirming a forensic view of justification whereby God is active in declaring sinners righteous on the basis of Jesus' alien righteousness and work at

---

[36] "Zwingli's Reply to Emser" in *Commentary on True and False Religion* (ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson and Clarence Nevin Heller; Durham: The Labyrinth Press, 1981), p. 369. For Zwingli, any holiness for the Church in a pre-glorified era was to be derived from its direct link to Jesus. Jaques Courvoisier, *Zwingli: A Reformed Theologian* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961), pp. 52–53.

[37] W.P. Stephens, *Zwingli: An Introduction to His Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 115.

[38] See Matthew 7:20; quotation taken from the ESV.

Calvary.[39] On the other hand, the Anabaptists parted ways with these reformers in two specific areas of soteriology that shaped their notion of the temporal manifestation of Kingdom. These included a synergistic view of salvation and a much stronger link between the external action of a person and that individual's eternal standing before God. Although the Swiss Anabaptists first embraced the ideas of justification set forth by Zwingli in the early 1520s, a soteriological deviation soon became apparent as the group gained their own unique voice in the mid-1520s. As this embrace of a different understanding of salvation surfaced in the early Anabaptist sources it facilitated the group's embrace of the gathered church model, which was critical to a new realization of God's temporal Kingdom.

First, the Swiss Anabaptists retained much of the optimistic appraisal of humanity that was indicative of the late medieval view.[40] This view of humanity stood in stark contrast to Luther and the other reformers who reached beyond the prevailing view of the Middle Ages and who drew heavily from Augustine in their affirmation of a more extensive view of humanity's depravity post Genesis 3. The Anabaptists contended that humanity played a participatory role in regeneration not just through a one-time confession of faith, but also an ongoing obedience to the commands of Christ. In his December 1524 work, *Protestation und Schutzschrift*, Felix Manz implied such freedom when he argued against the use of infant baptism by stating, "only those should be baptized who have repented, who have taken to themselves a new life, having

---

[39] The main point of derivation between Luther and Zwingli being the former's focus on the individual, while Zwingli saw a greater impact on all of society. Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, fourth edition (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), pp. 125–29.

[40] This was not a wholesale embrace of the position. Rather, as David Steinmetz has argued, it was a mediated position between the late medieval view and Luther's. See David C. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kaysersberg to Theodore Beza*, second edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 141–45. Details on the late medieval view of salvation and its impact on Luther leading up to his doctrine of justification by grace through faith all may be found in Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformation*, second edition (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 58 and 60–67.

died to their vices."[41] Manz employed language here that assumed individual believers take hold of their salvation in some part, which was at odds with the gifting language of justification found in the magisterial reformers. Manz's soteriological language was not well nuanced, but his entire argumentation against the use of infant baptism betrayed a synergistic slant.

What was implied in Manz became even more pronounced and clarified in Balthasar Hubmaier two years later. Entering the famous debate between Erasmus and Luther, Hubmaier argued in April 1527 that Luther's contention that "faith saves us" and "we have no free will" are merely "half-truths."[42] What exactly did Hubmaier mean by this? Reading through the Swiss Anabaptist sources from the 1520s one may come to the conclusion that the group waffled on their understanding of justification. At times Hubmaier and others seemed to affirm *sola gratia* in the tradition of Luther. Other times their stress on personal conduct and moral improvement sounded outright Pelagian, as Luther repeatedly argued. Bear in mind that some variation in language was attributed to the fact that none of these early Anabaptists were systematic theologians. Instead, these were occasional theologians speaking about pastoral matters as they arose in the context of ministry.

Kenneth Davis, in his appraisal of the Anabaptists' synergism, has parsed out what Hubmaier meant in his rejection of Luther's understanding of the human will.[43] Hubmaier did reject Luther's strong idea of depravity when he asserted "if one says there is nothing good in man, that is saying too much" and "for God's image has never yet been completely obliterated in us.[44] Nevertheless, this "good" was in no way present as a means to obtain salvation. God still had to first intervene with His grace, specifically through

---

[41] "A Declaration of Faith and Defense" in *The Reformation: Luther and the Anabaptists* (ed. W.R. Estep; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1979), p. 288.

[42] "Freedom of the Will, I" in *Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism* (trans. and ed. H. Wayne Pipkin and John H. Yoder; Scottdale: Herald Press, 1989), pp. 427–28.

[43] Kenneth R. Davis, *Anabaptist and Asceticism: A Study in Intellectual Origins* (Scottdale: Herald Press, 1974), pp. 149–60.

[44] "A Christian Catechism" in *Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*, p. 360–361. Much of Hubmaier's position on the will is embodied in his distinction between the uniquely distinct impact of Adam's fall on the particular aspects of the human body, spirit, and soul. Robert Friedmann, *The Theology of Anabaptism* (Scottdale: Herald Press, 1973), pp. 58–61.

the calling of the Holy Spirit and via the Word, to provide regeneration. This ordering specificity is why the framing of human freedom in Hubmaier's famous treaties was repeatedly qualified as being realized after the restoration.[45] Thus, a key component of Hubmaier's synergistic soteriology was recognition that the human response of obedience to the commands of Christ remained seated after regeneration and not prior to it.[46]

What this synergism meant for the Swiss Anabaptists is important. Justification was not God's divine activity in salvation alone, but was linked with the post-conversion activity of the individual responding volitionally in obedience. This is why the Swiss Anabaptists used language that framed salvation in terms of process. The German usage of the term *gelassenheit*, which meant "yieldedness" or "surrender," played a dominant role in shaping the Anabaptists' soteriology.[47] Here, the future attainment of heaven as the goal of salvation was inextricably linked with the present holiness of the individual as the realization of salvation via one's "yieldedness" to the will of God.[48] The temporal manifestation of Kingdom informed the eternal, heavenly Kingdom. Accordingly, it remained the confessing believer's ongoing responsibility to remain in a disposition of submission and obedience for that salvation to be deemed genuine.

Humanity's ability to respond was an adaptation by the Swiss Anabaptists of the medieval way of thinking about justification according to the Latin designation *facere quod in se est*, which conveyed the idea of humanity doing what lies within. While Alister McGrath has shown how this designation was understood in a variety of ways during the Medieval Period, the Swiss Anabaptists seem to have retained a late-Thomistic understanding of this, possibly transmitted to them by Johann Eck.[49] Aquinas' later thought

---

[45] "Freedom of the Will, I", pp. 439ff.

[46] Jürgen-Goertz, *The Anabaptists*, p. 63.

[47] C. Arnold Snyder, *Anabaptist History and Theology: Revised Student Edition* (Kitchener, Pandora Press, 1997), p. 152.

[48] This was an idea likely transmitted to the early Swiss Anabaptists and earlier set forth by Luther's one-time colleague in Wittenberg, Andreas Karlstadt. See "Tract on the Supreme Virtue of Gelassenheit," in *The Essential Karlstadt* *(ed. E. J. Furcha; Scottdale: Herald Press, 1995), pp. 28–39 and Pater, pp. 144–69.

[49] Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 88, 92–117.

on this, as presented in his *Summa Theologica*, stood strikingly similar to Hubmaier's idea that was outlined above. As McGrath clarifies,

> While Thomas continues to insist upon the necessity of a preparation for justification, and continues to discuss this in terms of people doing *quod in se est*, he now considers that this preparation lies outside purely natural human powers. Humans are not even capable of their full natural good, let alone the supernatural good required of them for justification.[50]

Therefore, both Aquinas and Hubmaier affirmed humanity's freedom to respond to God was dependent upon God's preceding intervention. The point of departure between them rested in the way the process of justification was then realized. Aquinas retained a focus on the appropriation of infused grace through the sacraments. However, Hubmaier and the Swiss Anabaptists looked elsewhere. Where these Swiss Anabaptists looked to the realization of justification moves to the second area of soteriological distinction from the magisterial reformers.

Second, the Swiss Anabaptists' synergistic soteriology led them to highlight a link between one's external actions and the internal disposition of that person's heart. Part of Luther's forensic understanding of justification included his *simul iustus et peccator* concept whereby a believer was understood to be both righteous and a sinner prior to glorification.[51] But by the mid-1520s, following the influences of reformers like Andreas Karlstadt, the Anabaptists started moving towards an ethical view of justification based on their emerging synergistic soteriology.[52] Such a shift permitted the group to avoid the tension necessary in Luther's view. This allowed the Swiss Anabaptists to view external action as a litmus test corroborating the veracity of one's confession. Just a few months prior to the first adult baptisms in January 1525, Conrad Grebel outlined such a commitment in his September 1524 letter to Thomas Müntzer:

Eddie Mabry has argued that Eck passed this view of justification to Balthasar Hubmaier during their shared time in Ingolstadt. Eddie Mabry, *Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of the Church* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1994), pp. 17–18.

[50] McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, p. 111.

[51] Ibid., pp. 119–22.

[52] Snyder, *Anabaptist History and Theology*, p. 51.

> Just as our forefathers had fallen away from the true God and knowledge of Jesus Christ and true faith in him, from the one true common divine Word and from the godly practices of the Christian love and way, and lived without God's law and gospel in human, useless, unchristian practices and ceremonies and supposed they would find salvation in them but fell far short of it, as the evangelical preachers have shown and are still in part showing, so even today everyone wants to be saved by hypocritical faith, without fruits of faith, without the baptism of trial and testing, without hope and love, without true Christian practices, and wants to remain in the old ways of personal vices and common antichristian ceremonial rites of baptism and the Lord's Supper, dishonoring the divine Word, but honoring the papal word and the antipapal preachers, which is not like or in accord with the divine Word.[53]

In early 1524, Hubmaier had already identified a link between saving faith and external action when he wrote, "such faith cannot be idle, but must break forth in gratitude toward God and in all sorts of works of brotherly love toward others."[54] Arguably the most vivid language used by Hubmaier to frame this idea came four years later in his January 1528 prison work, *Rechenschaft*, where he contrasted "mouth Christians" (*Maul Cristen*) with those genuine believers who linked profession and action in their lives.[55] In the First Article of *Rechenschaft* Hubmaier sarcastically narrated the position of unregenerate professing Christians when he stated, "Still, we claim to be Christians, good Evangelicals, and boast of our great faith, but have not touched the works of the gospel and the faith with our little finger. Therefore, as stated above, we are nothing but mouth Christians, ear Christians, paper Christians, but not hand Christians."[56] This interrelated nature of genuine faith and

---

[53] "Grebel to Müntzer," in Harder, pp. 285–86.

[54] "Eighteen Theses" in *Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*, p. 32. This same theme of synergistic participation and the importance of a "working faith" continued in Hubmaier's "Summa of the Entire Christian Life" in Ibid., pp. 84–87.

[55] "Rechenschaft" in *Balthasar Hubamier Schriften* (ed. Gunnar Westin and Torsten Bergsten; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1962), pp. 461–62.

[56] *Noch wellen wir Cristen sein, gut ewanjelisch, beriemen vnns eins grossen glaubens vnnd habenn aber die werckh des Ewangelions vnd glaubenns mit dem wenigisten*

external action left the Swiss Anabaptists to demand "a faith that bears visible fruit in repentance, conversion, regeneration, obedience, and a new life dedicated to the love of God and the neighbor, by the power of the Holy Spirit."[57]

Such an idea stood against Zwingli's claim that the church was to be rightly understood through three senses.[58] First, the word "church" corresponded to "the elect, who have been predestined by God's will to eternal life. Of this church Paul speaks when he says that it has neither wrinkle or spot."[59] This universal church was not discernable to humanity, hence Zwingli's employment of the modifying term "invisible." Second, the church was to be understood in a "general sense."[60] This spoke to all who confessed Jesus and rightly observed the sacraments. Since Zwingli affirmed the Swiss territorial Church this second church was visible to humanity, but was also composed of both the elect and the reprobate. Accordingly, the previous "invisible" church, the elect who were known only to God, was temporally hidden within the larger gathered body that included the non-regenerate. Third, the concept of church "is taken for every particular congregation of this universal and visible Church, as the Church of Rome, of Augsburg, of Lyons."[61]

The Swiss Anabaptists came to reject Zwingli's three-sense view of the church. Their developing belief that external action provided a window into one's internal disposition toward God allowed the Swiss Anabaptists to argue Zwingli's categories were flawed. Yes, the church was comprised of all genuine believers in Christ over the narrative of history. In that case the universal church was an

---

finger nie angeryert. Darumb seind wir, wie oben gesagt, nichts den Maul Cristen, Oren Cristen, papeyren Cristen, aber nit Hannd Cristen. "Rechenschaft," p. 462.

[57] Snyder, *Anabaptist History and Theology*, p. 151.

[58] Zwingli had earlier affirmed only two senses of the word church in his opposition to the Roman Catholic Church. The universal church with Jesus as its head (and not the Pope) and those local congregations gathered under the name and authority of Jesus Christ. Egli, Band I p. 459 and Band II pp. 54, 58, and 572. The division into three senses of the word church came in the midst of the Anabaptist controversy.

[59] "An Account of the Faith" in *Ulrich Zwingli: On Providence and Other Essays* (ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson; Durham: The Labyrinth Press, 1922), p. 43.

[60] Ibid., p. 44.

[61] Ibid., pp. 44–45.

eschatological Kingdom, for it would only be fully realized following glorification. However, the Swiss Anabaptists also argued that the fruits of faith (external action) tangibly demonstrated which people were and were not genuine followers of Christ. Accordingly, the gathered church that was previously hidden in the *corpus Christianum* was now attainable. As Davis has made clear, the hope of salvation "involved for them (the Anabaptists) not just forgiveness of sins, not just the quantitative but also the qualitative conception of eternal life which must begin in this life."[62] The visible church gathered on the basis of regeneration was now a present application of the Kingdom of God in a temporal sense. The constitution of these two churches, the universal and the gathered local church, were now distinguished in terms of time alone and not actual composition as the magisterial reformers had argued.

Therefore, the Kingdom of God for these Anabaptists was realized in a temporal sense via the gathering of a regenerate church body on the local level. The confessing believer needed only do two things that were critical for the ongoing maintenance of his or her salvation. First, the individual had to continually manifest regeneration through obedience to the commands of Christ in Scripture and remained a part of a regenerate church body. Here, the realization of salvation was not simply future focused on the basis of a declarative act of God, nor was it mired in the confusion of a mixed church body. Such was the Anabaptists' perception of the magisterial reformers' forensic view of justification. Rather, the realization of salvation was focused on the present and the confessing believer's daily, willful participation in obedience to the commands of Christ. This is largely why the previously mentioned separatism and two-kingdom ideology embodied in the Fourth Article of the *Schleitheim Confession* was so critical. As G.H. Williams has contended, "In this article on separation (*absünderung*), what the predestinarian doctrine of the Magisterial Reformation at least keeps invisible the free-will perfectionism of the 'free church' makes boldly visible and mordantly moral."[63] Second, the professing believer had to remain a part of community of faith gathered on the basis of regeneration and believers' baptism. What was a future Kingdom hope for Luther and Zwingli was, for the Swiss

---

[62] Davis, p. 135.

[63] George Huntston Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 183.

Anabaptists, already a present reality through the believer's daily involvement in the gathered church.

The Keys to the Kingdom

With the establishment of a believers' church the Swiss Anabaptists had come to embrace an ecclesiastical model that looked dramatically different than the Swiss Church they had broken from. The group had embraced a non-territorial form of the church that was deeply rooted in a separatist mindset and focused on the corporate gathering of truly converted followers of Christ. Along with this newly constituted believers' church came the conviction that this community of faith in the temporal realm was acting in direct concert with the Kingdom of God in the eternal, heavenly sense. As a natural consequence the Anabaptists were forced to address the inevitable question of when sin surfaced in that regenerate body. As the Swiss magisterial reformers repeatedly argued, how could the Anabaptists' church be truly pure in a pre-glorified era? Moreover, given that only the Lord knows the heart of any one person, how could any gathered church in the temporal realm be an accurate reflection of the greater heavenly Kingdom? Here, the Swiss Anabaptists' implementation of the practice of church discipline and the importance of Jesus' usage of the phrase "the keys of the kingdom" answered these questions and left an indelible impression on their view of the temporal application of Kingdom. The Anabaptists' use of church discipline not only became a hallmark of the movement, but it also helped further establish the growing idea that the gathered church was a temporal, earthly reflection of its parallel heavenly Kingdom.

One of the earliest mentions of church discipline came in Grebel's 1524 letter to Müntzer. In the midst of outlining acceptable beliefs and practices for the true church, Grebel linked the observance of the Lord's Supper with the use of church discipline. Just after introducing the idea of a wayward brother in the context of the fellowship meal, Grebel reasoned, "It (The Supper) should not be practiced without applying the Rule of Christ in Matthew 18; otherwise it is not the Lord's Supper, for without the same [rule], everyone pursues externals. The internal, love, is neglected, if brethren and false brethren go there and eat."[64] Later, Grebel con-

[64] "Grebel to Müntzer," p. 288.

tinued to promote the need for church discipline when he exhorted Müntzer to "march forward with the Word and create a Christian church with the help of Christ and his rule such as we find instituted in Matthew 18 and practiced in the epistles."[65] Grebel was not overtly explicit here in what church discipline was for or even how it was to be utilized practically speaking. Nevertheless, his statements to Müntzer stressed that to remain within the fellowship of the gathered, local church one must walk in obedience alongside that assembly. He also correlated the use of discipline for "one who does not intend to live in a brotherly way" with the Supper and saw this in some unspecified way to be a part of this church he was exhorting Müntzer to institute.[66]

Notwithstanding Grebel's focus on discipline, its importance as a part of the Anabaptists' emerging ecclesiology may most clearly seen at Schleitheim and in the works of Hubmaier. In each of these, the responsibility was placed on the local, gathered church to accomplish two critical and interrelated tasks, both of which spoke to that community's identity as a temporal manifestation of the Kingdom of God. First, the local church body was to help shepherd its members in the ongoing maintenance of abiding in Christ through a repentant life of obedience. Second, the local church was tasked with preserving its regenerate orientation by utilizing a power bequeathed to the church; a power that Jesus spoke of as the keys to the kingdom.

Following their formal break with the Zürich Church the Anabaptists had utilized believers' baptism as the visible gateway into a regenerate church. A non-coerced confession of Christ, followed by one's willful surrender to the waters of believers' baptism, had become a means of distinguishing true believers from the non-regenerate. Remaining in that fellowship via the communal observance of the Supper then represented the ongoing abiding in the faith that was part of the ongoing demonstration of authentic faith. In light of such an understanding of the sacraments, the Anabaptists grew to view church discipline as a vital practice that tethered the acts of baptism and the Supper together. Church discipline's clear connection between baptism and the Supper may be found in the Second Article of Sattler's *Schleitheim Confession*:

---

[65] Ibid., p. 289.

[66] Ibid., pp. 288–89.

> The ban shall be employed with all those who have given themselves over to the Lord, to walk after [Him] in His commandments; those who have been baptized into the one body of Christ, and let themselves be called brothers or sisters, and still somehow slip and fall into error and sin, being inadvertently overtaken… But this shall be done according to the ordering of the Spirit of God before the breaking of bread, so that we may all in one spirit and in one love break and eat from one bread and drink from one cup.[67]

Hubmaier took the link seen in the *Schleitheim Confession* even further as he explained the importance of discipline both baptism and the Supper. Setting the framework for this idea Hubmaier argued for the importance of believers' baptism as a requisite to both the Supper and church discipline. Using a fictitious dialogue between two figures discussing the true faith, Hubmaier stated,

> For with outward baptism the church opens her doors to all believers who confess their faith orally before her and receives them into her bosom, fellowship, and communion of saints for the forgiveness of their sins. Therefore, as one cares about the forgiveness of his sins and the fellowship of the saints outside of which there is no salvation, just so much should one value water baptism, whereby one enters and is incorporated into the universal Christian church.[68]

Here, Hubmaier employed strikingly Roman Catholic language that highlighted his belief that membership in a gathered church via baptism was the temporal realization of God's Kingdom in direct correlation to the greater, heavenly Kingdom reality. The Supper was understood as the repetitive action whereby members of the church continually renewed their commitment both to that fellowship and to walk in obedience to Christ. The sacraments were of vital importance to the Anabaptists. Not in that the sacraments infused the grace requisite for salvation, for that was the Roman Catholic Church's position. But in that participation in these sacraments demonstrated regeneration through the ongoing pursuit of moral improvement and obedience within a community of faith.[69]

---

[67] "The Schleitheim Brotherly Union," p. 37.

[68] "A Christian Catechism," p. 351.

[69] A similar line of reasoning may be found in Brian C. Brewer, *A Pledge of Love: The Anabaptist Sacramental Theology of Balthasar Hubmaier* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2012), p. 142.

Therefore, for Hubmaier, the two sacraments were merely tangible signs of the repentance that was requisite for regeneration.

Church discipline, as a point of contact between baptism and the Lord's Supper, served to shepherd baptized members of a gathered community in the maintenance of their salvation. This was accomplished in a host ways. First, drawing on the separatism that was previously outlined, the gathering of an assembly of regenerate believers helped remove its members from the sinful world. Part of the impetus to separate out from the world was the conviction that the world was evil and could, in-turn, corrupt one desiring to walk in obedience to Christ. Separation became as much about removing oneself from the temptation of sin as it was anything else. Given the strong language of disdain for things outside of the gathered church, the removal of any person via the ban only highlighted the gravity of unrepentant sin for any wayward member. As Brian Brewer has pointed out, "the ban is also exercised as a deterrent for the sake of strengthening its own fellowship and to protect it from slander or shame."[70]

Second, despite accusations from those outside of the movement, the Anabaptists in those early years never affirmed Christian perfectionism.[71] In fact, as evidenced by those Anabaptists writing in the formative years of the movement, residual sin was a reality for all believers. That was precisely why the gathered community of believers was so critical. The individual success of any church member's pursuit of "yieldedness" to Christ was rooted in that person's corporate participation in the body of believers. Isolated, individual growth was a foreign concept outside of the community. This belief was so strong that the baptismal pledge was not just a covenant made to God and the community of believers regarding persevering in one's confession. The act of baptism was understood to be that person's willful submission to correction by the church community when sin should arise post-conversion. This

---

[70] Brewer, p. 151.

[71] For a helpful rebuttal of the erroneous notion of Anabaptist perfectionism see Hans Georg Fischer, "Lutheranism and the Vindication of the Anabaptist Way," *MQR* 28 (1954), pp. 31–38 and Harold S. Bender, "Perfectionism," *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, IV, pp. 1114–15.

was an idea especially cultivated in the thought of Hubmaier and linked with the baptismal pledge.[72]

Third, the use of church discipline via the ban was understood to be a redemptive practice. All too often church discipline may be exclusively linked with the idea of excommunication. Expulsion from the church may be a consequence of church discipline, but the hope of restoration remained the Anabaptists' stated goal throughout the process of discipline.[73] Hubmaier clarified this when writing about the ban, "The same takes place also for the sake of the sinner, 1 Cor. 5:2, so that he might become aware of his misery, and willingly forsake sin and thereby escape from the eternal ban and exclusion, which the master of the house, Christ Jesus himself, will apply."[74] Love became the guiding principle behind the implementation of discipline in the believers' church.[75] Even the ostensibly demeaning act of "shaming," employed via the Anabaptists' usage of the German verb *schamrot*, was framed within the context of love.[76] Given the congruous relationship between the temporal Kingdom via the gathered church and the eternal Kingdom, there was simply too much as stake to act otherwise. Thus, church discipline had salvific impulses for the Anabaptists.

Beyond shepherding congregants towards a lifestyle of submission to Christ, sin in the church body was addressed as a means of literally preserving Christ's bride in the temporal realm. This idea was wrapped in the language and Anabaptists' usage of the keys to the Kingdom. Institutionally, the believers' church had been established as a temporal, visible representation of the eternal, invisible Kingdom of God. Accordingly, the consecration of the church was not an option or suggestion; rather, it was mandated by its very establishment. Here, the Swiss Anabaptists argued on the basis of

---

[72] "A Christian Catechism" and "On Fraternal Admonition," in *Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*, pp. 349, 351, 353, 381, and 383.

[73] The redemptive nature of church discipline for the Anabaptists has been explored by John D. Roth, "The Church 'Without Spot or Wrinkle' in Anabaptist Experience," in *Without Spot or Wrinke: Reflecting Theologically on the Nature of the Church* (ed. Karl Koop and Mary H. Schertz; Elkhart: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 2000), pp. 13ff.

[74] "On the Christian Ban," in *Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*, p. 411.

[75] Accordingly, Hubmaier contended that when repentance was realized the church should receive the wayward member "again with joy, as the father did his prodigal son." "A Christian Catechism," p. 354.

[76] Haas, p. 129.

Matthew 16:19 that just as the gathered community played a vital role in promoting the ongoing obedience requisite for salvation, so too were the people of God entrusted with the preservation and promotion of a pure church. Offering a modified form of the typical late Medieval Roman Catholic reading of Matthew 16:19, Hubmaier eschewed the notion of a sacramental theology. Instead, he contended that the keys to the Kingdom were the binding and loosing powers of believers' baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Before delving into these keys it may be helpful to first understand the source of the keys. For the Swiss Anabaptists, God had entrusted to the church the power to make pronouncements of judgment concerning the veracity of one's faith. Not only had God given each local church the power over excommunication, as evidenced by the Matthew 18:15–20 narrative. God had simultaneously given to these local assemblies the medium whereby they might correctly discern the authenticity of a person's commitment to Jesus. As outlined above, this is where the importance of external action as a litmus test for genuine conversion was so critical. Opening his work on the ban, Hubmaier stressed,

> It is known and is evident that this authority is given to the Christian church and comes from Christ Jesus her spouse and bridegroom, as his heavenly Father has given the same to him, in heaven and on earth… But when he was to ascend into heaven and to sit at the right hand of his almighty Father, no longer remaining bodily with us on earth, just then he hung this power and these keys at the side of his move beloved spouse and bride."[77]

Hubmaier continued, "This same power and these keys Christ gave and commanded to the church after his blessed resurrection… Namely to preach the gospel, thereby to create a believing congregation, to baptize the same in water."[78] Nevertheless, the power

---

[77] "On the Christian Ban," p. 411.

[78] Ibid., p. 412. It should be noted that in order to frame the giving of these keys to the local assembly of believers Hubmaier was forced to move away from the singular form of σοι "you" found in the Greek New Testament and to recast the entrusting of the keys via the plural German *Dir* "you." Matt. 16:19 in *The Greek New Testament*, fourth revised edition, edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesllschaft, 1998), p. 62 and "Von dem christlichen Bann" in *Balthasar Hubmaier Schriften*, p. 368.

behind these keys was the gospel, which then became embodied in a church comprised exclusively of regenerate believers.

Accordingly, the first key of baptism served as a visible means of recognizing those who had confessed Christ and committed themselves to both the corporate church and Christ. Given that believers' baptism followed regeneration for the Anabaptists, this initial key provided the "binding" together of those who had already confessed Christ. But the power of the visible, gathered believers' church did not stop at baptism. Through the second key of the Lord's Supper, gathering around the elements was just as important. Participation in the Supper was an important demonstration, both publically and communally. The Supper showed members of the local church continually demonstrating their perseverance in the faith via their participation in that local body. That was precisely why any unrepentant member was withheld the bread and the cup; these were a symbol of the unity of the church body and representative of that person's salvation. For those who shared in the meal, these were "bound" in the sense that they were enduring in their baptismal pledge. However, those who had been removed from the Table (and in turn the fellowship) were "loosed" from the community. These were no longer abiding in their commitment to Christ and the community; as such their salvation very much was in doubt. As Christof Windhorst has stressed,

> Here Hubmaier assumes that outside of the church there is no salvation. The church, however, has two keys that are applied in baptism and the Supper: In baptism the church is loosed and the forgiveness of former sins is demonstrated. In the Supper the church itself can be locked-those rejected by the church community not having their sins forgiven. It is clear here also that the binding and loosing of the church's word is a deciding factor over the forgiveness of sins.[79]

---

[79] *Hier geht Hubmaier davon aus, daß außerhalb der Kilche kein Heil ist. Die Kirche aber hat zwei Schüssel, die in Taufe und Abendmahl zur Anwendung kommen: in der Taufe wird die Kirche aufgeschlossen und die Vergebung vergangener Schuld dokumentiert; im Abendmahl kann die Kirche sich selbst verschließen –dem aus der Kirchengemeinschaft Ausgestoßenen werden die Sünden nicht vergeben. Deutlich ist auch hier, daß das bindende und lösende Wort der Kirche über die Vergebung der Sünden entscheidet.* Christof Windhorst, *Täuferisches Taufverständnis: Balthasar Hubmaiers Lehre zwischen Traditioneller und Reformatorischer Theologie* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 126–27.

Therefore, the ban was not a sacrament proper, as baptism and the Supper were.[80] Yet, its importance rested in the fact that it was a mediating mechanism that promoted the true gospel and allowed a regenerate church to be preserved. The magisterial reformers naturally argued against using discipline in this manner. They did not understand how the Anabaptists could police that which they could not perceive, especially given the anonymous nature of faith in the temporal realm. But for the Anabaptists who held to a different soteriological construct and view of the church, this was not an issue. In fact, given that the temporal Kingdom of the church was a direct reflection of the eternal, the Anabaptists would not be enjoined to lessen the requirements for membership in any local church body.

Conclusion

The words of Jesus bound men like Zwingli, Grebel, Manz, and Hubmaier together. During the early 1520s the Bible had stirred in their collective minds concerns related to the Roman Catholic Church, knit their hearts together in small group studies around Zürich, and served as a catalyst to the formal introduction of Reformation. However, Christ's words also eventually became the very thing that divided Zwingli from those who would bear the label Anabaptist as well. As the Anabaptists took what their former mentor had taught them about the authority of Scripture and began to ask important questions about the church, they came to embrace different ecclesiological convictions. Over just a window of three or four years those beliefs left the Anabaptists with a vision of the church that was outside the territorial model. In its place the Anabaptists established a church founded on the basis of separatism, regeneration, and discipline. The Anabaptists' church was one that looked completely different than the Roman Catholic or Zwinglian manifestations they grew to detest. Instead, theirs was a church that looked heavenly. But of course, that was exactly the point they believed Christ was making in the gospel accounts. Their church was a foretaste of the Kingdom to come.

---

[80] This is a point outlined in Brewer, pp. 146–48.

STR 5/2 (Winter 2014) 233–67

Book Reviews

James Henry Harris. *The Forbidden Word: The Symbol and Sign of Evil in American Literature, History, and Culture*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2012. xiv + 132 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1620322604. $18.00 (Paperback).

Pastor and theologian James Henry Harris writes a witty, engaging book that centers on the use of the "n-word" in Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* and in American society in general. Part literary exegesis, part memoir, Harris criticizes America's racist past as he positions his own experience, growing up African-American in central Virginia during the 1960s, within that history. Harris argues that there is no essential difference between Twain's copious use of *nigger* in *Huck Finn* and the use of *nigga* by African-American Hip-Hop artists: both have capitalized on the American creed of African-American inferiority. One major implication of this argument is that every African-American has his or her own history with "the forbidden word," which also serves as an index of the collective historical experiences of all African Americans.

Harris uses his experience as a first-time reader of the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* and the only African-American student in an English class on the book in 2006, as the gateway to his commentary on certain aspects of African-American social history as well as his own family's history. Harris' text weaves different themes of *Huck Finn* and African-American life in ways that are quite insightful at times, and disjointed at others. In chapter five, for example, Harris re-tells a colorful and enjoyable story about his father and uncle watching the second Muhammad Ali-Sonny Liston fight in May 1965. However, there is no discernible connection between this chapter and the issues that swirled around the forbidden word. The reader is forced to work overtime to make a link (assuming that there is one).

Then there's Harris' keen perception in relating a seemingly mundane theme in *Huck Finn*, smoking, and African-American social life. Harris states that in *Huck Finn* everyone smokes (as did nearly half of the students in his class). "Huck Finn loved smoking," writes Harris (p. 36). From this point, Harris rehearses his history with smoking and how the tobacco culture of central Vir-

ginia pervaded every area of African-American life, producing an addicted and unhealthy society. Even though Harris makes this astute connection about the love of smoking in Huck Finn's day and in his own, he fails to connect the history of tobacco cultivation in Virginia with African slavery. There was Harris, a young African-American man, working in a tobacco factory in 1970 and then using an addictive substance. However, tens of thousands of African and African-American enslaved men and women cultivated tobacco in Virginia from the 17th century to the middle of the 19th century to enrich white plantation owners and tobacco companies. The bottom line is that the tobacco industry has exploited African-Americans since its colonial beginnings.

An aspect of the book in which Harris employs nuanced thinking is his application of Du Bois' double consciousness theory to African-American usage of *nigger*, or its street/Hip-Hop/phonetic version, *nigga*. Harris relates that in the class he "was on edge" as the word came up in scholarly conversation, but when he returned to his life as an African-American man living and working among other African-Americans he heard the word used too. He raises *the* question: is the use of *nigger* categorically different when used by African-Americans? Harris answers this question in the negative. In using another anecdote, he recalls having a conversation with one of his sons about the use of *nigga* in Hip-Hop and rap music. Harris' son contended that *nigga* meant nothing in that lyrical context (p. 116). Much to Harris' dismay, he had to remind his son that *nigger* represents African-American suffering historically and at present. He went on to assert that the use of *nigga* by African-American Hip-Hop artists is nothing more than "Black capitalist exploitation of its own people" (p. 116).

Harris' *The Forbidden Word* is a timely work that explores many aspects of African-American social history and grassroots thought. It is gritty at times because it reflects a major aspect of African-American history and contemporary life. The real strength of the book is that Harris acknowledges his discomfort with *nigger* regardless of who uses the word, whether it is the great American novelist and humorist Mark Twain, or the Grammy award winning rap group Three Six Mafia. As he applies Du Bois' double consciousness theory, Harris argues convincingly that the use of *nigger* perpetuates African-American oppression; and in the cases of Twain

and Hip-Hop artists, the use of the word capitalizes on the all-American perception of African-American inferiority.

Eric M. Washington
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Walter Elwell and Robert W. Yarbrough. *Encountering the New Testament: A Historical and Theological Survey*. 3d ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013. 448 pp. Hardback. ISBN: 978-0801039645. $49.99 (Hardback).

Walter Elwell is emeritus professor of biblical and theological studies at Wheaton College, where he taught for more than twenty-five years. He also taught at North Park College and Belhaven College (Mississippi). Elwell's most well-known work is perhaps his *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (2001, 2d ed.). Robert Yarbrough has served as professor of New Testament at Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis since 2010. Prior to this position he taught at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (1996–2010), Covenant Theological Seminary (1991–1996), Wheaton College (1987–1991) and Liberty University (1985–1987). Among other works, he has authored *1, 2, and 3 John* in the Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament series (2008) and *The Salvation History Fallacy? Reassessing the History of New Testament Theology* (2004).

Elwell and Yarbrough's *Encountering the New Testament* first appeared in 1998, followed by a second edition in 2005. These previous editions were well received by professors and students. The third edition is the result of suggested improvements from dozens of professors from various Christian traditions (e.g. Baptist, Lutheran, charismatic, and Catholic) who used the book in their classes. Elwell and Yarbrough *did not* make dramatic changes to their most recent edition. Following the request of their reviewers, they retained the same basic design and much of the same content. Indeed, a comparison of the second and third editions shows a remarkable degree of similarity in regard to content. Nevertheless, noteworthy changes have been made. Elwell and Yarbrough attempt to make the third edition more reader-friendly by clarifying confusing sections and modifying diagrams and charts. In addition, they incorporate the findings of recent scholarship into the text and in the annotated bibliographies at the end of each chapter. Generally speaking, with the third edition the authors strive to produce a

New Testament survey that is more clear, concise and up-to-date than previous versions.

The authors' goal is to survey the New Testament canon with a special concern to identify and discuss the major theological themes of the New Testament. In addition, they seek to provide a basic understanding of the historical context within which the writings emerged. The authors successfully accomplish their goals. A careful reading of *Encountering the New Testament* will result in students gaining a sound theological and historical foundation for the New Testament from a conservative Evangelical perspective.

Elwell and Yarbrough give the most attention to exploring the contents of the New Testament writings. As with other surveys, they examine the authorship, date, provenance, outline, purpose(s), characteristics, theological emphases and critical issues of each book. Their survey of the biblical writings is marked by careful attention to the unique theological contribution of each work. Granted, with some writings one would have liked certain themes to have received greater attention. For instance, I would have liked a more thorough discussion of the gospel's progress and unity among believers in the section on Philippians (pp. 295–299). Nevertheless, for the most part Elwell and Yarbrough provide an excellent summary of each book's major themes.

Along with surveying the works of the New Testament canon, the authors also examine topics closely related to the study of the New Testament, such as the message and form of the four Gospels (Chapter 3), the teaching ministry of Jesus (Chapter 9) and historical criticism (Chapter 10). The authors' presentations of historical criticism (pp. 139–153), Jesus' life (pp. 105–121) and Jesus' teaching ministry (pp. 123–137) are particularly noteworthy. However, Elwell and Yarbrough's discussion of Scripture authority is too brief (pp. 9–10), especially given the important role it plays in interpretation. All chapters conclude with a summary of the authors' major points ("Summary"), an annotated bibliography ("Further Reading") and a list of relevant questions ("Study Questions") that give students the opportunity to review and reflect on the key points of the chapter.

The authors' intended audience is college students or older non-specialists. Those with little to no prior exposure to the New Testament will likely find the work quite challenging in certain sections. It is the unfortunate rise of biblical illiteracy, not Elwell and Yar-

brough's textbook, that is to blame. In truth the authors have gone out of their way to make the work accessible for most readers.

Evangelical scholarship has produced several new or revised New Testament surveys in recent years, including those by Carson and Moo (2005); Cohick, Green and Burge (2009); Gundry (2012) and Köstenberger, Kellum and Quarles (2012). Elwell and Yarbrough's *Encountering the New Testament: A Historical and Theological Survey* (2013) is one of the better surveys to appear. I highly recommend this work.

Michael L. Bryant
Charleston, South Carolina

Victor H. Matthews. *The Hebrew Prophets and Their Social World.* 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012. xi + 244 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0801048616. $26.99 (Paperback).

Victor H. Matthews has offered a helpful introductory level book that focuses on the social setting and historical background of the Old Testament world and its impact on the Bible's prophetic message and interpretation. Matthews has written prolifically in the area of Old Testament and ancient Near East cultural backgrounds, having published the popular book *Manners and Customs in the Bible*, as well as *The IVP Bible Background Commentary*, among many others. In fact *The Hebrew Prophets and Their Social World* is not a new work, but is rather a revised and updated edition of 2001's the *Social World of the Hebrew Prophets*.

The book is a survey of both the main prophetic characters and books found in the Old Testament. Following the introduction, the first chapter offers a good orientating overview of the geography of the prophetic world, discussing the features of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Syria-Palestine. Chapter 2 is, perhaps, the most important in the book, as Matthews sets out a definition of the person and function of Old Testament prophets. In this chapter, a prophet is defined by his/her role within the economic, royal, and judicial systems of the day. Additionally, the prophet's call (call narrative), vocabulary, and social role as defender of the poor are introduced. Chapters 3 (Moses, Balaam), 4 (Samuel, Nathan, Ahijah, Man of God from Judah), and 5 (Elijah, Elisha, Micaiah) offer good discussion on the early non-writing prophets who lived before or during the monarchy. These are especially good chapters, as Matthews pays attention to the social world of some of the more overlooked

Old Testament prophets. For example, by discussing the details of the location and the symbols of power (e.g. thrones, robes) in 1 Kings 22, Matthews does a good job of illustrating the intimidating court scene facing Micaiah as he delivers a message of doom to King Ahab (pp. 66–67).

Chapters 6–15 transition to a discussion of the social setting and message of the writing prophets. Matthews handles the discussion of these prophets according to thematic concerns, and is in constant dialogue with other Old Testament prophets, historical books, and ANE parallels. For example, Matthews places Amos within the geographical and social setting of the eighth century BCE, before concluding with the thematic discussions of social injustice and religious hypocrisy. Likewise, his treatment of Hosea offers a brief discussion of the political realities of the prophet's day, his marriage to Gomer, and the possibility that Hosea was a Levite, before turning to the thematic concerns of the marriage metaphor, idolatry, and the knowledge of God.

In a decision that may raise some complaints, Matthews has chosen to present these prophets according to a commonly understood chronology of their ministry, rather than in terms of their final form and canonical location within the Old Testament. As a result, the book Amos is the first prophet mentioned, Isaiah is handled in terms of three traditional authors, and Obadiah follows a discussion of Habakkuk. While such a decision does make some sense if the aim is to discuss the historical settings of the prophets (e.g. the rise of ANE world powers and their influence on the individual books), it bypasses the current trend of discussing the Book of the Twelve and Isaiah as complete literary units. The result is a bit of a jumble as the reader is first introduced to Isaiah 1–39 in chapter 9, but has to wait until chapter 14 before returning again to that prophetic book. Chapter 14 is also broken up, and discusses the themes of Second Isaiah (Isa. 40–55) and Haggai-Zechariah 1–8, before returning to Trito-Isaiah (Isa. 56–66) and Zechariah 9–14. While understandable, this organization works against a more complete final form reading of prophetic themes as they are developed within the books themselves.

Such a criticism, however, should not distract from the overall value of the book, as there is much here to recommend. *The Hebrew Prophets and their Social World* is an introductory textbook, and the intended audience is never forgotten. The book offers a glossary which defines various boldfaced terms (e.g. theodicy; eschatology;

Shephelah), as well as a brief bibliography for further reading. Additionally, the book offers students numerous excurses, set apart in boxes within the text, which allow for further clarification by way of comparison with parallel biblical or ANE background texts. All discussions are well supported by examples from the biblical text, and additional text references fill the page. It is accessible and interesting, and by focusing on the social world of the prophets, offers a bit of a different approach than other introductory texts, and adds a real-world depth to the individual prophets that is often missed by beginning readers. Overall, this is an excellent resource for introductory level classes in both the academy and the church.

Jason T. LeCureux
Brisbane, Australia

Mark David Hall. *Roger Sherman and the Creation of the American Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. xi + 224 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0199929849. $45.00 (Hardback).

The most recent survey of the ideas that led to the creation of the American republic—Alan Gibson's 2006 book, *Interpreting the Founding*—identifies progressive, liberal, classical republican, economic and even Scottish influences on the Founders, but generally discounts the notion that Protestantism played much of a role. For a while the primary voices raised in opposition to this prevailing view of the intellectual origins of America came in the form of polemical works written for a popular audience by Christian authors such as Peter Marshall, John Eidsmoe and Tim LaHaye. However, in recent years, a steady stream of more scholarly works published by respected university presses, has emerged likewise to challenge the reigning view of the American founding. Mark David Hall's *Roger Sherman and the Creation of the American Republic* is the latest installment of these books.

While ostensibly a biography of Roger Sherman, one of America's Founding Fathers, this book is also a sustained argument in support of (1) historians acknowledging the influence of Protestant (namely Reformed) political theory on the formation of the American government, and (2) historians developing a fuller, more accurate understanding of the Founding by considering the Founders as a whole rather than focusing on a select few. In doing so, Hall builds upon and advances similar arguments made by Alan Heimert,

James H. Hutson, John G. West, Jr., David W. Hall, Jeffry H. Morrison, Daniel Dreisbach, and others.

Roger Sherman provides a strong basis upon which to make these arguments. A self-identified Calvinist whose pastor was Jonathan Edwards, Jr., Sherman played an influential role in almost every stage of the Founding. Sherman was the *only* founder to help draft and sign the Articles of Association, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution. He was one of the most influential delegates at the Constitutional Convention, he helped write the Bill of Rights, and he was the oldest and second-most active member of the First Congress. Though held in high esteem by his contemporaries, scholars have tended to overlook Sherman's role in early American history. This unjustified neglect is vividly illustrated by the fact that Supreme Court justices have made 112 distinct references to Thomas Jefferson when interpreting the First Amendment's religious clauses, but have only referenced Sherman three times. Sherman, however, had not only written extensively on church-state issues, he actually helped write the First Amendment. Jefferson, by contrast, was in France when the First Amendment was written, debated and passed by Sherman and his colleagues in the First Congress! Needless to say, neither Sherman nor many of his colleagues viewed the Establishment Clause they wrote as erecting a wall of separation between church and state, as the clause is generally interpreted today.

Hall not only shows that scholars need to give greater consideration to the roles played by Founders other than Jefferson, Madison, Washington, Franklin and Adams, but also to the influence of Reformed political theory on the formation of the American republic. Though averting the notion that America was founded as a Christian nation, Hall nevertheless convincingly argues that Reformed theology must be recognized as one of the intellectual foundations of the Founding (if not the primary foundation). Scholars generally credit John Locke with formulating the political philosophy that undergirded the American Founding. However, Hall, who himself is not a Calvinist, asserts that Reformed political philosophy pre-dated and likely influenced Locke. In a chapter dedicated to tracing the origins and development of Reformed political theory, Hall asserts that "within a generation of Calvin, virtually every Reformed civil and ecclesiastical leader was convinced that the Bible taught that governments should be limited, that they should be based on the consent of the governed, that rulers should

promote the common good and the Christian faith, and that unjust or ungodly rulers should be resisted or even overthrown" (p. 16). This Reformed political theory was being taught, preached, and articulated in books and pamphlets in the American colonies well before Locke's works began to be widely read there. Hall buttresses his argument by claiming that many of the leaders (though not always the best-known ones) of the American Revolution were Reformed Christians, and that research has shown that the Bible was cited much more often than Locke's writings by those who championed resistance to British authority. What made Locke so influential on the eve of the Revolution, according to Hall, was the fact that his views accorded so well with Reformed political philosophy.

Hall doesn't demonstrate conclusively that Reformed political philosophy guided the Founding Fathers, but tracing the origins of influence is virtually impossible and has yet to be done for America's founders. Nevertheless, Hall has written an important, readable book that is a valuable addition to the stream of books providing a scholarly and more accurate understanding of the Christian aspects of the American Founding.

Brent J. Aucoin
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Thomas R. Schreiner. *The King in His Beauty: A Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013. xx + 714 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0801039393. $44.99 (Hardback).

Tom Schreiner has given the church a magnificent resource in his recent whole Bible theology. While biblical scholarship has shied away from biblical theologies that cover the entire canon, Schreiner makes an important contribution to a growing corpus of such works. Along with adding to the list of biblical theologies of both Testaments, Schreiner also takes a unique approach, in that he focuses on the storyline of the Bible as his governing paradigm, rather than a particular "central theme." G. K. Beale has taken a storyline approach in his *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, but Schreiner is among the forerunners for doing so with a whole Bible theology. Even though central themes are not at the forefront of Schreiner's method, he still identifies 1) YHWH 2) dwelling in the land 3) with his people as central aspects of the storyline he traces.

The organization of the book is straightforward, as Schreiner walks the reader through the biblical material book by book. He mostly follows the English order of the Old and New Testaments, although he does place Acts with Luke and the Johannine Epistles with John's Gospel. Each chapter covers a book or section of the Bible, and the primary focus of each chapter is how the story advances, especially with respect to restoring what was lost in the Garden and to the three central aspects of the story. Schreiner deftly ties together the major covenants of the OT, demonstrating how Adam's tasks are lost in the Fall but redeemed in the promises to Abraham and David. He also masterfully leaves the reader expecting the messianic eschatological hope to be fulfilled at the end of his OT exploration, and carefully shows how the Gospels present Jesus' life, death, resurrection, ascension, and giving of the Spirit at Pentecost as that fulfillment. Further, these connections and explanations of the story are not simply conjectures by the author; instead, Schreiner continually demonstrates the exegetical and narrative basis for his conclusions. The future reader should note, though, that Schreiner's exegetical points and intertextual insights can be understood by the layperson and the trained biblical scholar or theologian alike.

Talk of intertextual insights brings us to another strength of the book, namely that Schreiner is able to piece together various texts throughout the canon of Scripture to weave particular narrative threads. Sometimes these are woven using intertextuality, while at other times the connections are more conceptual. Either way, it is refreshing to see an esteemed biblical scholar explicitly recognize the inherent textual and conceptual unity of the Scriptures, which, as Schreiner notes in the introduction, is a product of his recognition of both the human and divine authors' role in producing a meaningful text. Schreiner does not shy away from appealing to the divine author, something that is sorely lacking today even amongst evangelical interpreters.

Two relatively minor criticisms bear mentioning, one organizational and one conceptual. On an organizational level, many of Schreiner's biblical theological conclusions are left within the paragraphs of each chapter (for instance, his mention of grace and election in the discussion of Jacob's story, p. 22), instead of in some sort of concluding summary of the biblical theological points to be made at the end of each chapter. Although he includes "interludes," where he summarizes each part of the biblical story (of

which there are nine in this book), there are no places in this volume where Schreiner collects his biblical theological points. It appears to me that he is content to summarize the biblical story, rather than also summarize his biblical theological conclusions. But this begs the question: is biblical theology merely summarizing the story, even if in doing so one is textually and conceptually connecting different parts of the narrative? Is there more required of the task, say listing central aspects, plot movements, or expectations? As mentioned above, Schreiner does list YHWH dwelling in the land with his people as defining central aspects of the story, but he does not come back to each of these in a tight organizational fashion. This is not to say that he doesn't return to these themes over and over again throughout his storyline summary, but it is to say that he does not do so with any regularity in terms of the book's organization. One also wonders here if there are not other central aspects of the story, or perhaps sub-categories of the three he mentions, that could not be teased out or listed somewhere in the book.

One other criticism comes in his understanding of canonical order. Schreiner says in the introduction that he wants to pay attention to the final form of the text, which includes the order of the books in the canon. He goes on to say, though, that any particular order will do (pp. xv–xvi). And as one reads, especially in the New Testament, it appears that not just any attested order but really any order one conceives will do, as he removes John from between Luke and Acts and places the Johannine Epistles with John's Gospel. For me, this appears to be a lack of critical engagement with the arguments for utilizing a particular order, and especially the difference it makes in OT theology to use the English order rather than Hebrew order. Schreiner is correct to say that one is not more inspired or correct than the other. However, to say it makes no difference in reading strategy is, to my mind, missing the mark in that discussion.

These two slight criticisms aside, *The King in His Beauty* is a magnificent compendium of the riches of evangelical biblical theology. Schreiner as always is a careful, meticulous, and engaging writer, and his walk through the biblical storyline is one that will be useful to both lay readers and scholars alike. I highly recommend it to anyone wanting to understand how the Bible is unified in its story about YHWH dwelling in the land with his people.

Matthew Y. Emerson
Riverside, California

Kutter Callaway. *Scoring Transcendence: Contemporary Film Music as Religious Experience.* Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013. 253 pp. Paperback. ISBN: 978-1602585355. $29.95 (Paperback).

The rise of interest in film to integrate theology and overtly biblical narratives is a welcome practice, but hopefully not a trend. In his book *Scoring Transcendence* Kutter Callaway strikes out to analyze the role of music in cinematography as a medium for viewers to experience God aesthetically. More specifically, Callaway interacts with how music, when conjoined with deep existential themes in film, helps to reach our affective states and through that experience draw us closer to God. As Callaway notes, the artistic medium is particularly effective when the content of film and music coincide with our own experiences (e.g. the death of a loved one) and may provide insight into profitable ways in which we can understand such experiences. Thus his thesis is that "a musically aware engagement with film opens up new possibilities for theological dialogue and reflection that would remain otherwise inaccessible" (p. 4). There are few books with such a focused theme, and for this Callaway is to be commended.

The essence of his theological case for religious experience through artistic mediums is grounded in general revelation, and his commitment to the arts falls into that mold (p. 155). The Spirit is understood as Yahweh's *ruach*, "The divine breath of life that perpetually animates the whole of the created order" (p. 164). Accordingly, the notion of "spirit" as incorporeal must be jettisoned and replaced with "the creative energy of the divine that is present in our physicality, the transcendent spirit whom we encounter in and through immanence" (p. 164). That is, we understand the transcendent through our experiences with the immanent. Borrowing from Moltmann, Callaway links the creative activity of God to the creative activity of persons created in the image of God. Aesthetics, as a manifestation of creativity, can be a medium through which people have a confronting experience of God's presence. Given the focus on music in this text, Callaway advances the idea that music, as a nonrepresentational form of communication, is more effective in "signifying that which lies beyond the limits of visual representation" (p. 173).

To make the case clear Callaway advances the following ideas: First, aesthetic understanding is non-propositional, that is, it is not

a text (p. 189). Instead, a film is an audiovisual experience that the person encounters. Second, given the possibility of such an encounter, the "theological significance of music in film compels us to reconsider the devotional nature of filmgoing" (p. 192).

The films that Callaway chooses to integrate into the discussion are far-ranging. He analyzes the use of music in *There Will Be Blood*, *Up*, *Moulin Rouge*, and *The Tree of Life*, among others. This is not to say that these movies are overtly religious; many of them are not. Rather, the focus of his book is how music impacts the experience of the film as it allows us to *feel* the moment. Music may bring to bear in greater significance the intimacy of a kiss, the pain attending the death of a loved one, or the happiness that follows personal success in some form. So, beyond the image on the screen, there is the "surplus in need of interpretation" (p. 106). And to explain how we interpret, Callaway invokes Schleiermacher. He united feeling (an inward and immediate awareness of how the whole of our selves is affected by the existence of the Infinite in the finite), and intuition (our perception of the divine operating in our lives through our lived experiences). In other words, musical expression provides understanding that is ineffable.

If there is any criticism of this book, it is to note the sheer lack of interaction with philosophers and theologians that have both the expertise and interest in the cross section of aesthetics and theology. This is a concern because there is a solid history of such interaction, one such example being Nicholas Wolterstorff. Moreover, given the rise of interest in the epistemology of imagination and its implications for apologetics, a more concerted effort to dovetail artistic mediums with theological meaning would have greatly benefitted the book. Otherwise I recommend this book as a welcome advancement in studies pertaining to the Christian faith and the arts. It is clearly written, insightful, interesting, controversial at points, and trendsetting for further discussions.

Jeremy Evans
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Robert B. Chisholm. *1 & 2 Samuel*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013. xiii + 337 pp. Hardback. ISBN: 978-0801092251. $39.99 (Hardback).

This commentary is one of three volumes now published in the Teach the Text Series, whose aim is to combine strengths of tradi-

tional devotional commentaries with the sophistication of modern Hebrew linguistics and ancient Near Eastern history—a commentary that "utilizes the best of biblical scholarship but also presents the material in a clear, concise, and attractive format" (p. ix). The structure for each volume treats each successive pericope along five parallel lines: Big Idea, Key Themes, Understanding the Text, Teaching the Text, and Illustrating the Text. The meat of the commentary is in Understanding the Text, which is further divided into four interpretive perspectives (with minor exceptions in some volumes): The Text in Context, Historical and Cultural Background, Interpretive Insights, and Theological Insights.

The foreignness that is typical of any new format quickly gives way to a discussion that is consistent, clear, and easy to follow. A professional layout of color photos, figures, and cutouts adds significantly to the reading experience. Chisholm's light-handed style, moreover, fits well with a commentary designed to be highly accessible. The author and editors also provide more than twenty superb sidebars that sit alongside this format, addressing difficult or controversial issues like, "Did Jonathan Sin?" (1 Sam 14), The Problem of Genocide" (1 Sam 15), "David's Expanding Harem" (2 Sam 5), and "The Legal Background of Tamar's Request" (2 Sam 13). These sidebars and their footnotes alone make the commentary a valuable resource for teachers and preachers.

As for the commentary proper, the introduction is brief and sufficiently lucid to encourage readers not to pass it by, as is often the case. However, brevity comes with the weakness of saying too little about important historical and canonical issues. On the whole, Chisholm reads Samuel in the light of Judges, and only occasionally discusses theological parallels in the Pentateuch (law or narratives), Chronicles, and the New Testament. For example, and from a devotional or pastoral perspective, Chisholm's otherwise illuminating discussion on the family division between Jonathan and Saul fails to pick up on echoes throughout the lives of Israel's first family: Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Jacob and his children.

Without question, the "Interpretive Insights" are the heart and soul of this commentary. As an accomplished Hebrew scholar, Chisholm is well-suited to give novice readers an appreciation for the sophisticated repetition and wordplay that are so characteristic of the author(s) of 1–2 Samuel. These interpretative sections consistently guide the reader to the key twists and turns in the narrative.

The "Theological Insights" that follow are, by and large, typically summaries of the narrative and usually too brief to be of significant value to the reader. In the last two decades we have witnessed an outpouring of scholarship calling for a renewal of "theological interpretation" that goes beyond mere exegesis and historical study. While the dialogue has a wide range of opinions, there is a common desire to hear God speak into the issues facing our contemporary culture.[1] To be fair, Chisholm does not understand "theology" in this way and uses the "Teaching the Text" section to make the text applicable to modern audiences. But those sections tend to comment solely on devotional types of issues.

As an example, in light of the breakdown of the modern family in the West, it is surprising to see Chisholm dismiss the passage on Eli and his sons (1 Sam 2:12–36) as unfruitful for further discussion. The same could be said for his decision not to extend the commentary on David's sin with Bathsheba to the poisonous effects that pornography and marital infidelity are having in our world today. Or again why not say more about the way Absalom used his gifts to steal the people's loyalty from his father and the way contemporary leaders in businesses, politics, and churches are undermined by those who are able to use their charisma to gain a subversive own following? Doesn't 1–2 Samuel have anything in it that might enlighten the problems of our overly economized culture, consumerism, sensualism, individualism, or ethical pluralism? Pastors and teachers could surely use help making those connections.

Finally, in the "Illustrating the Text" sections at the end of each chapter, Chisholm gathers an impressive range of quotes, music, images, stories, and illustrations for pastors and teachers to use in their preparation. Unfortunately, these often feel a little like an add-on with little help in knowing how Chisholm imagined they would be connected to the text.

By virtue of their unique focus, all commentaries have shortcomings; but this is a well-designed series and its weaknesses are minor. And if this volume is any indication, the series will become a trusted companion for those who use it to preach and teach.

Ryan P. O'Dowd
Ithaca, New York

---

[1] See, e.g. *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible* ed. K.J. Vanhoozer, et al., (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 19–25.

J. Stephen Yuille. *Looking unto Jesus: The Christ-Centered Piety of Seventeenth-Century Baptists*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013. xxiv + 96 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1620321775. $15.00 (Paperback).

J. Stephen Yuille has established himself as a trusted guide to the piety of the English Puritans with his numerous publications in that area. Now, Yuille has turned his attention toward a neglected group from the same time period. While some could question whether Baptists can properly be called Puritans, Yuille has rightly recognized the shared theological commitments and piety of these seventeenth-century contemporaries. In his introduction, Yuille highlights four reasons he is attracted to the Puritans. They are God-fearing, heaven-seeking, sin-hating, and Christ-exalting. In the seventeenth-century Particular Baptists, Yuille has found kindred spirits with the Puritans that he loves so much.

In *Looking unto Jesus*, Yuille introduces the modern reader to two of the more obscure of the admittedly little known group of Particular Baptists—Thomas Wilcox and Vavasor Powell. The book's structure is very straightforward. In chapters one and three, a primary source by each of the subjects is reproduced. In chapters two and four, Yuille provides a theological analysis of the Christ-centered piety of each of the respective authors. Chapter one is a modernized edition of the 1676 edition of Wilcox's *A Guide to Eternal Glory*. This sermon is a strong appeal to look to Christ for both justification and sanctification. In Wilcox's own words, "In every duty, look at Christ; before duty to pardon, in duty to assist, and after duty to accept" (p. 7). Chapter two features an examination of the Christ-centered piety of Wilcox in his lone extant work. Here Yuille summarizes *A Guide to Eternal Glory* as containing a call to examine self, a call to combat despair, and a call to consider Christ. Permeating the sermon is the kind of Christo-centric piety characterized by the Puritans.

Chapter three contains a modernized edition of Vavasor Powell's 1646 tract titled *Saving Faith Discovered in Three Heavenly Conferences*. In this short treatise, Powell presents three hypothetical conversations between Jesus and a Publican, Jesus and a Pharisee, and Jesus and a doubting Christian. Although these conversations are fictional, all of the comments by Jesus are either direct quotes from Scripture or a close paraphrase of biblical truths. To the Publican, who represents a sinner broken over his sin, Jesus responds with

mercy and compassion. To the Pharisee, who represents the self-righteous, Jesus calls for repentance. To the doubting Christian, Christ offers peace and assurance. All three are directed to look to Christ and away from themselves. Chapter four offers Yuille's analysis of Powell's Christ-centered piety. Yuille expertly shows that Powell has demonstrated how Christ alone can meet the needs of the Publican's thirst, the Pharisee's pride, and the Christian's doubt.

As a historian, a few things stood out to me as meriting more information. First, I would like to have seen a clear reference in the footnotes as to which edition of the primary sources Yuille was using (the details are in the bibliography, but absent from the text and footnotes). Second, I would have liked more information on how Yuille determined that Vavasor Powell in fact wrote *Saving Faith Discovered in Three Heavenly Conferences*. In a footnote, Yuille explained how the treatise became falsely attributed to Wilcox, but not how he knew it was written by Powell (the treatise was originally published in 1651 under Powell's name). Third, a comparison with other editions of the texts included would have provided clarity regarding some of the hard to read or understand portions of the primary texts. For example, a comparison with the 1699 edition of Wilcox's *A Guide to Eternal Glory* would have confirmed Yuille's conjecture that "religions" should have been "relations" (p. 12 fn. 11). Likewise, a comparison with the 1651 edition of Powell's *Saving Faith Discovered* would have revealed Scripture references which the editor noted as illegible (e.g. p. 53 fn. 7 and p. 58 fn. 8).

Despite these minor quibbles, *Looking unto Jesus* is a book worthy of being read and re-read by modern Christians desiring to have their hearts kindled in devotion to Christ. Yuille's selection of these two primary sources and his rich theological analysis accomplish his purpose of exposing the modern reader to Puritan piety. By reading these two seventeenth-century Particular Baptists, it is hoped that the interested reader's horizons might be expanded to realize that there is a larger body of Puritan literature available than one might previously have known.

G. Stephen Weaver Jr.
Frankfort, Kentucky

Barry Webb. *The Book of Judges*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012. xx + 555 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0802826282. $50.00 (Hardback).

Webb's long anticipated commentary on Judges was worth the wait, a welcome addition to scholarship on this interesting, engaging and often disturbing biblical book. Non-specialists will find Webb's writing to be not only informative, but surprisingly comprehensible; scholars will find the fruits of his research to offer a wealth of historical, literary and theological insights into Judges.

In his preface he explains his preference for "emotionally warm" over cool, detached academic writing, which accurately characterizes the tone of his work. He describes himself as an evangelical Christian and states his commendable desire that his effort will be of service to the church.

Webb's eighty-seven page introduction includes a black/white map of tribal Israel and the standard discussions relevant to the book of Judges: ancient commentators' references (pp. 4–9), historical issues (pp. 10–20), compositional concerns (pp. 20–32), book structure (pp. 32–35), recent scholarship (pp. 35–53), theological contributions (pp. 53–55), relationship to Christian canon (pp. 55–67), textual issues (pp. 67–69), translation (pp. 69–74) and bibliography (pp. 74–87). Readers who want Webb to get to the point might be frustrated at his meandering (albeit, engaging) style, as he begins by asking, "But what is a book?" and then does not mention his particular book (i.e., Judges) until the end of his third paragraph.

His discussion of the historical background for the book is well-informed and balanced (he tentatively favors an early 15th century date for the Exodus), but his conclusions about the dating of Judges still seem overly precise ("roughly 1326–1092 B.C."; p. 12). In his detailed overview of the history of the book's formation Webb provides readers with a clear summary of scholars who focus on the redaction of the Deuteronomistic History generally, as well as those who examine the book of Judges specifically (Noth, Richter, Smend, Veijola, Dietrich, Soggin, Cross, Auld, Boling and Gross). Webb also includes an extended overview of research on Judges (from 1970–2010) that is less concerned with redactors and more concerned with the final form of Judges as a literary work (Bal, Klein, Hamlin, Amit, Yee, O'Connell, Block, Schneider, McCann, Brettler, Matthews, Niditch, Butler and Gross).

In his summary of the book's content, Webb includes Barak in his list of judges (Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Barak, Gideon, Tola, Jair, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon and Samson; p. 34), but curiously excludes Deborah despite the fact that the text states that Deborah "judged Israel" and Israel came to her "for judgment" (Judg. 6:4, 5), while Barak is never described similarly. Webb's three divisions of the book will not prove controversial though: first, a two-part introduction (1:1–3:6); second, an extended central section narrating the careers of the judges (3:7–16:31); third, a two-part epilogue (17–21). As he explains his translation conventions, Webb helpfully observes the problem of simply translating the Hebrew *hinné* as "behold", an archaic expression rarely used except in certain Bible translations (e.g., KJV, NAS, ESV), and then the textual commentary includes examples of his various alternatives (e.g., "hear this":1:2; "look": 6:37).

Personally, I found Webb's discussions of women and violence in Judges particularly insightful as he addresses these notoriously problematic aspects of the book's narrative. Webb argues that the recorded abuses of women ("texts of terror") are "viewed as abhorrent" by the book of Judges and are consequences of their apostasy and idolatry (p. 58). He acknowledges that the book mixes violence and humor in a disturbing manner (e.g., Ehud's blade being enveloped by King Eglon's fat: Judg. 3:21–22), but as he notes, "the coarse humor of Judges is typical of the heroic genre" (p. 61). Webb goes into depth justifying the violence of the conquest in Joshua and of the ongoing battles against the Canaanites in Judges as necessary to teach Israel about warfare, about the necessity of obedience and about the consequences of disobedience. While readers may not be fully satisfied with his justifications for the book's violence, Webb humbly acknowledges that the Christian scholar's goal is not "to tame the Bible" but to help "the church listen to it" (p. 67).

Webb's textual commentary includes, in addition to a fresh translation, numerous tables, diagrams, outlines and schematics to encapsulate the structure of passages (less in the later sections), as well as frequent summaries and seven helpful excursuses. As he summarizes the Gideon narrative, he deftly brings together observations connecting the judge's story to characters in the Exodus story: "The man who started by being a 'Moses' ends here by being an 'Aaron,' the fashioner of an idol for Israel to worship" (p. 266). In his excursus entitled, "Should Jephthah have broken his vow?"

he concludes that Jephthah was wrong to make the vow and "compounded the wrong" by sacrificing his daughter to fulfill his obligation (p. 336).

Webb's commentary effectively achieves his desire stated in the preface and will certainly serve the academy as well as the church to better understand the problematic book of Judges.

David T. Lamb
Hatfield, Pennsylvania

Jonathan R. Wilson. *God's Good World: Reclaiming the Doctrine of Creation.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013. xvii + 283 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0801038815. $24.99 (Paperback).

Jonathan R. Wilson is Pioneer McDonald Professor of Theology at Carey Theological College in Vancouver, BC. In *God's Good World: Reclaiming the Doctrine of Creation*, he argues that the Church has neglected the biblical doctrine of Creation—Wilson calls it a case of "teleological amnesia"—and all of Western culture is the worse for it.

Rather than responding to the onslaught of naturalism, materialism, and Darwinism, Wilson argues that theologians of the last 250 years turned inward. Instead of developing a robust theology of Creation, they focused on salvation history. This abdication had consequences—nearly all of them bad. Theology as an intellectual discipline was banished from the academy, the Church embraced a nearly-Gnostic view of salvation (salvation came to be understood as deliverance from Creation rather than the redemption of Creation), and society came to view technology in messianic terms.

One of the worst effects of abandoning Creation as a worldview is that, in the modern mind, Creation has been transformed into Nature. This left the modern world with four miserable options: conclude that there is no meaning, purpose, or teleology to the universe; try to manufacture meaning for ourselves; try to believe that the universe creates its own purpose or telos (however, if death is the final outcome for all then it is difficult to avoid fatalism); or attempt to construe meaning in the light of another god besides the Triune God of the Bible. Wilson contends that the only proper telos is Jesus Christ (Col 1:15–21). Failure to recognize this leads to despair, and much of modern society's frenetic activities are attempts to deny, manage, or ameliorate this despair. Only a recovered theology of Creation—a theology that always views Cre-

ation in the context of redemption—can heal the pathologies of society.

Wilson presents his case in three parts. First, he surveys the damage caused by ignoring the doctrine of creation. He likens modern theologians to a band of adventurers who have abandoned their guide but do not realize how lost they really are. Second, he presents an approach for developing a robust theology of creation. We should never separate the story of Creation from the story of redemption. We cannot understand Creation simply by looking at its beginning; it can be properly understood only in the light of the *eschaton*. A truly Christian approach to Creation will be Trinitarian, emphasizing the relational, life-giving work that involves each member of the Triune Godhead. Last, Wilson devotes the remainder of the book to applying the motifs developed in part two (what he calls "construing the world"). He engages with the concepts associated with the word "world" and then either coopts them or sets them in contrast to the biblical understanding of Creation. He examines concepts such as a clockwork universe, the blind watchmaker, the selfish gene, survival of the fittest, and natural selection—with varying degrees of success.

Concerning the charge that theologians avoided the modern challenges to the Christian view of Creation by focusing on salvation history, Wilson makes his case. This move may have protected biblical theology from modernity but it also removed theology from the public square. He convincingly shows the negative impact this move has had on the academy, society, and the church. Yet, in part three, Wilson gets mixed results when he applies his approach. For example, he critiques the ascendency of technology over wisdom (he calls this phenomenon *techne*) and he examines the role of advertising. Though he makes very good points, Wilson sometimes gives the impression that he finds both the technological culture and the advertising industry intrinsically evil.

Wilson gives little attention to the question of why theology responded to the challenges of the Enlightenment by taking the inward turn that it did. The ascendency of historical criticism seemed to undermine biblical authority at just the same time that scientific disciplines such as geology and biology appeared to leave no place for a historical fall. Further discussion in these areas would have been helpful. *God's Good World* is not the final word on the subject;

Wilson doesn't claim that it is. But he makes a good case for where the discussion should go from here.

Ken Keathley
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Jonathan Stökl. *Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: A Philological and Sociological Comparison*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East. Vol. 56. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012. xvi+ 297 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-9004229921. $151.00 (Hardback).

Prophecy in the Ancient Near East is the edited version of Stökl's Ph.D. dissertation, completed at the Oriental Institute, Oxford University, under the supervision of Hugh Williamson and Stephanie Dalley. Stökl is an expert in ANE languages and has published frequently in the area of ANE prophecy, particularly in regards to gender roles in the prophetic context. He is currently a part of the ERC (European Research Council) project "By the rivers of Babylon: New perspectives on Second Temple Judaism from cuneiform texts."

Because this is a revision of his doctoral work, the book bears all the marks of a Ph.D. dissertation. The first chapter defines terms and sets the limits of the project. One of the key aspects of the book is the definition of "prophet" as set apart from dreamers/astrologers and other diviners. For Stökl, a prophet "refers only to individuals who receive a divine message, the words of which are understandable without further analysis with a special skill (such as reading livers)" (p. 10). The rest of chapter one is spent in brief discussion of Egyptian, Hittite, Ugaritic, Aramaic, and Greek prophetic inscription texts. Following chapter one, the book is divided into four sections: 1) Prophecy in Old Babylonian Sources; 2) Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources; 3) Prophecy in the Hebrew Bible; and 4) Comparison and Conclusion. In the first section, Stökl distinguishes between an *āpilum*, a court spokesman responsible to the king (p. 49), and a *muhhûm*, an ecstatic cult/temple official who may have had a secondary function as a prophet (p. 57). As with the Babylonian sources in section one, the second section begins with a list of known texts, and then defines key Assyrian terms associated with prophecy, lastly turning attention to compositional issues. What Stökl argues is that the Neo-Assyrians used prophecy in a number of different ways, which included incorporating older prophecies into contemporary ones, or using the older

prophecies as a type of template to give a recognizable shape and authority to new prophecies (p. 141). Such a process reflects a similar scholarly belief of the composition of OT prophetic texts.

In the section on the Hebrew Bible, Stökl discusses how the term נביא (a member of the court, not critical of the kingship, who communicated messages through letters, p. 171) eventually came to be understood as the dominant term for OT prophets, and differentiates it from חֹזֶה (a court official who received divine messages through visions, p. 196) and רֹאֶה (a diviner with no official court position, p. 200). Stökl argues that נביא was a term for a court prophet, not a pre-exilic writing prophet, (p. 184), but came to be associated with Jeremiah, and was then redactionally applied the three kinds of נביאים in the OT: 1) the ecstatic groups; 2) the technical diviners; and 3) the writing prophets (p. 174). Throughout all these sections Stökl covers a broad spectrum of issues associated with ancient prophets, including good discussions on gender, and the role of lay prophets within the society.

Despite the occasional typographical error, the book is well organized and well written. It is also exceptionally well researched. Stökl's knowledge of cuneiform texts, ANE languages, and modern research languages is impressive. Additionally, he presents all his findings with a cautious attitude, one that is quick to acknowledge the limited aspects of ANE cuneiform research, and the tenuous nature of many of its conclusions.

Because of the necessities of the research and the multiple languages used to present it, many may find reading the book a bit difficult. Also it quickly becomes apparent that Stökl's narrow definition of "prophet" controls much of his conclusions, and one wonders if the ancients would have had such strict boundaries between professions. Furthermore, Stökl's findings on the Hebrew prophets are based heavily on redactional arguments, which while well researched, always allow room for disagreement. For example, in order to arrive at the same conclusion on the use of the terms חֹזֶה and נביא, one has to agree that Amos 7:10–17 (as well as Judges 5:12) is a late addition to the text (pp. 182–184). Similar arguments are used to define/dismiss the use of "prophet" associated with Moses and Abraham in the Pentateuch as late (p. 176), as well as to read "prophet" in Isaiah 36–39 as postexilic, finding instead a more authentic reading in a pre-exilic Isa 3:1–7 (p. 179). Nonetheless, readers will find some of Stökl's conclusions very enlightening, for example, how music became associated with prophecy (pp. 211–

215), or that "more female prophets existed than the biblical text might suggest" (p. 217). For pastors of churches or undergraduate students looking to understand and apply OT prophetic texts better, this book should probably not be high on the reading list. However, for research students interested in examining the shared cultural world of the ANE and OT prophecy, this book presents a comprehensive, scholarly contribution.

Jason T. LeCureux
Brisbane, Australia

Jackson Wu. *Saving God's Face: A Chinese Contextualization of Salvation through Honor and Shame.* Evangelical Missiological Society Dissertation Series. Pasadena: WCIU Press, 2013. xii + 355 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0865850477. $25.00 (Paperback).

In *Saving God's Face,* Jackson Wu (a pseudonym) provides a helpful integration of theory, cultural studies, theology, and biblical exegesis. He also presents a strong argument for utilizing the honor/shame motif as a lens for theologizing in general, though he focuses primarily on a (21st century Han) Chinese context. Wu, a Westerner, currently serves cross-culturally as a theological educator in such a context. The work at hand is his published dissertation completed through Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, the third dissertation from this school published in the increasingly important EMS Dissertation Series.

Over a total of six chapters, Wu argues that "a dialogically contextualized Chinese soteriology, which draws heavily upon honor-shame concepts prevalent in Chinese culture, issues forth in a biblical understanding of atonement and justification" (p. 1). In the first major chapter, he critiques various models of contextualization, particularly those from a Western perspective. Overall, he makes the bold and apropos claim that Western missionaries and theologians have assumed too much about the content of the gospel when encountering non-Western worldviews. He thus calls for greater emphasis on biblical theology alongside cultural exegesis in lieu of overreliance on Western systematic categories. For him, contextualization is deeper than just communicating seemingly timeless a-cultural truths. Of particular concern to Wu, the West relies too heavily upon the law/guilt motif, supposedly arising out of Greco-Roman roots. He thus identifies this as an issue of theological method—contextualization itself must be part of the theo-

logical process. Contextualized theology, then, he argues, "empathiz[es] with a local context and then find[s] affinity with the Scripture" (p. 35).

Chapters three and four include Wu's helpful treatment of various Chinese contextualizations followed by his detailed and scholarly discussion of honor/shame within a Chinese worldview. Any prospective theologian or missiologist in a Chinese context would greatly benefit from interacting with these chapters.

In the fifth, and arguably most important chapter, Wu emphasizes the biblical language of honor/shame which should inform theological discourse on soteriology. Wu discusses the terminology of atonement, righteousness, justification, honor, and shame, among others. He concludes with an invaluable study of Romans through honor/shame and group identity motifs. Central to his argument in this chapter, Wu maintains that Paul's emphasis in Romans was not upon individuals and their guilt for offending general moral principles, but Paul was "countering ethnocentrism" by showing how "justification signifies one's group identity" whereby Christians are members "of God's family, which consists of those from among all nations who give their allegiance to Christ" (p. 292).

Wu's conclusion includes thoughts on the implications of his study. His bibliography afterwards is expansive. Most helpful to the reader, Wu's final inclusion is a scripture index.

This publication is thought-provoking—a must-read for any Westerner considering theological or missiological work in a Chinese context. Furthermore, this is a serious read for any ethnic Chinese theologian. What this work demands is a response, for good or ill, from Chinese thinkers. Wu honors the biblical text and also, as it appears to this Westerner's review, the Chinese worldview. But more importantly, this work goes a long way towards demonstrating the strong honor/shame motif in Scripture.

If theologians were to take a dialogical approach, then the contributions Wu so aptly identifies are as important for correcting blind spots within Western theology as for theologizing Chinese-ly. In other words, Western theologians would do well to emphasize the honor/shame motif in Scripture, not because Western or Chinese culture demands it, but because Scripture demands it.

At the same time, while Wu reminds the reader more than once that the honor/shame motif is a starting point, not an exhaustive framework for theologizing, Scripture demands an interaction with

the law/guilt motif. Perhaps there is an unwarranted assumption in Wu's critique of Western theology. Could it be that the reason why Western theology has emphasized law/guilt is not primarily because of its Greco-Roman heritage but because of the rather large collection of laws in the Hebrew Scriptures, including the Ten Commandments? Could it be that the emphasis on penal substitution and imputed righteousness derive from biblical presentations, even if they fit within western frames of reference? While Wu presents his argument as both/and, not either/or, it will be important to see how the both/and works itself out in Chinese theologizing.

As a final and small point of contention, this review and this book use the term "Western" rather loosely. Even among cultures traditionally deemed "Western," there is plurality, cultural and theological plurality. This plurality is only increasing, not just because of immigration but because of the rightful challenge to hegemony previously exercised by majority groups, among a host of other reasons. Scholars would do well to be more precise when using this language. Nonetheless, Wu's dissertation is a valuable addition to the field and a must-read for theologians and missiologists alike.

Wesley L. Handy
Clifton, New Jersey

Heath Thomas, Jeremy Evans, and Paul Copan, eds. *Holy War in the Bible: Christian Morality and an Old Testament Problem.* Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2013. xii + 352 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0830839957. $26.00 (Paperback).

This thirteen-essay collection, which began life as a 2009 colloquium involving Duke Divinity School and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, approaches the topic of biblical holy war from a variety of angles. It may be summarized as "a kind of 'reader' [to] enable discussion and deliberation from a number of different perspectives: biblical, ethical, philosophical and theological" (p. 18).

Following the introduction, Douglas Earl employs primary texts in order to reject "pervasive and powerful" assumptions that the book of Joshua fueled, inspired or justified later conquests like the Crusades. However, Stephen Chapman emphasizes that the goal of divine warfare (a term he prefers to "holy war") "is not violence but peace" (p. 61). God cannot be "fully extracated" from warfare

because God is involved in every aspect of life," even in flawed or sinful human efforts like war. And Heath Thomas' essay wraps itself like a scarf around Chapman's, using Lamentations to explore divine warfare and the ability of God's people to express lament for such warfare. Thomas thus notes the inapplicability of sacred-secular distinctions.

Tim Gombis stresses that believers' warfare in the NT is not against other humans, but is supernatural in its nature and mechanics and based on the cosmic victory won by God and inaugurated by his Son (Eph 1:20–23). The question of whether God has waged, is waging, or will wage war against "children of wrath" (2:3) is not addressed. The following essay by Alan Bandy on Revelation takes up the question. Faithful witnesses (martyrs) present their case to the Judge; they do not take matters into their own hands. God is righteous in his judgments and their severity. His "warfare is not arbitrary but central to the question of divine justice" (p. 108).

David Lamb addresses God's compassionate motivation in wars (even against Israel). He is the defender of the oppressed and the punisher of oppression. Thus "warfare motivated by compassion and by [justified] anger is less problematic" than thoughtless vengeance (p. 151). Like Lamb and other contributors, Earl (chapter eight, concerning holy war and *herem*) addresses the use of "Holy War" as a label, and the book's discussion of this question begins to be repetitive. However, Earl finds *herem* to be non-genocidal in both Testaments.

Daniel Heimbach develops a theology of crusade, which is both initiated and led by God, but in a manner that could be verified by those called to participate (p. 196). He rejects a variety of Christian approaches to crusade, but affirms God's right to do what he wills (not least because of the evidence in Revelation 19).

In chapter ten, "The Ethics of 'Holy War' for Christian Morality and Theology," Copan and Matthew Flannagan take a philosophical approach to the biblical text and its critics. Here we find a rare reference to the judgment merited by the Canaanites (p. 233), noted also in Genesis 15:13–16 (pp. 230–1); these and related biblical warrants should perhaps have been more thoroughly explored elsewhere in this volume. Copan and Flannagan emphasize hyperbole in the text in light of ancient literary parallels, citing biblical scholars like Hess and philosophers like Wolterstorff. They illustrate the "hyperbole" phenomenon in scripture: for instance, in its own literary (Deuteronomy—Judges) and cultural contexts, "Josh-

ua . . . [sometimes appears] to be something other than a mere literal description of what occurred" (p. 215).

Glen Stassen avoids the "well-worn" question of when war is or is not just by focusing on "The Prophets' Call for Peacemaking Practices," which certainly helps calibrate readers' expectations. Robert Stewart similarly encourages deeper reading practices that temper the criticisms of New Atheists who "have cherry-picked the Bible."

Murray Rae carefully explores and critiques three 20th century approaches to "just war" (Niebuhr, Barth, O'Donovan), rejecting them in favor of a commitment to forgiveness, compassion and sacrifice that takes seriously Christ's teachings and his cross: "The battle against evil waged there sets the pattern for those who seek to love others as Christ has loved us" (p. 310). Christians certainly need more resistance to violence. But does a pristine position of non-violence exist? Chapman casts doubts on this position (p. 65). Do verbal criticism, Jesus' warfare against demons and verbal warfare against opponents, economic sanctions (whether international or ecclesial, 2 Thess 3:10), and excommunication flow from a pacifistic understanding of the cross and human conflict? While the early Christian commitment to pacifism is significant and widespread, it is far from comprehensive.

Finally, one of the best essays in the book is Stephen Williams's "'Holy War' and the New Atheism," who colorfully and thoughtfully rejects increasingly common false characterizations of the Bible and Christianity.

The book is more academic than apologetic. Some authors make no reference to OT warfare texts. However a significant common denominator is the authors' insistence on placing controversial texts in canonical and theological perspective. God's character is not determined solely with reference to his justice, nor his is justice solely determined with reference to particular instances of judgment. Evans and Thomas thus end the work by highlighting God's lament of human sin: "Like a dam that finally breaks loose, God gives way to judgment and punishes a rebellious people. The point is, however, that God is not presented as overly quick in his judgment: his mercy is long and his anguish in bearing sin is sure."

Jason B. Hood
Moshi, Tanzania

W. Edward Glenny. *Hosea: A Commentary based on Hosea in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013. 203 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-9004245563. $140.00 (Hardback).

The Septuagint Commentary Series aims to treat the LXX texts as literary works in their own right, with a focus on Hosea (in this case) as it would have come to early Greek readers unfamiliar with Hebrew. While the importance of Vaticanus (B) for Hosea studies lies entirely in the background as a dialogue partner for translations of the Masoretic Text (MT), the author puts B squarely in the foreground with mentions of the MT used to support or dialogue with B only when significant variances or interesting moments allow. Indeed, there seem to be more references to the New Testament than to the MT.

The author provides a critical text of B with full notes and translation followed by a standard verse-by-verse commentary, focusing on grammar and translation issues. Regarding the material choices made throughout, the author seems fairly unadventurous. For instance, he takes rather mainstream views of Hosea's marriages as both regarding Gomer, first as a woman who would be unfaithful, and then his "buying [her] back" as his wife in ch.3. The debated meaning of 6:7 with *'adam* (MT) taken as a generic "man" in B goes almost unnoticed, another byproduct of the series being uninterested in debates outside the LXX itself. And so on throughout, with rather standard readings for the larger interpretive questions in the book.

The drawback of the commentary comes in the aim of the series. On the one hand, the series can be seen as a natural extension of "canonical" interpretations: treating the texts in their final form, and so seeing B as a moment in Hosea's textual life. But then we would expect some kind of historical introduction to the audience of B, how particular lines of interpretation or cultural influences impacted the reading of the text. But nothing of the audience for B comes into play. Glenny offers a good defense for hesitance regarding the "theology" of the translator, which I fully appreciate. But the (normally unfair) criticism of canonical interpretations ignoring history seems to apply: historical knowledge is invoked for semantic matters but little more.

An illustration of the difficulty caused by this approach comes in the repeated references to the "Baals" in Hosea or to various

forms of cultic idolatry. Much debate has gone into whether or not Baal worship even existed in 8th century Israel, the nature of those (possible) ritual matters, and thus how to understand either the history or intent of the references. This commentary on B, because it has little concern for the "original" text or utterances, finds itself in a strange land. So after hinting at some of the debate on fertility/cult prostitutes mentioned by Herodotus, we are told, "However, such general practices, if they existed in the time the LXX was read, would not satisfy the grammatical requirements in this passage [4:11–13]" (p. 97).

The concern with the practices that existed when the LXX was *read* (a rather large stretch of history) completely detaches the text from 8th century Israel, or even from the concerns of the editor(s) of Hosea, whenever the book may have been put together. Likewise with the "vain practices" at 6:8 we are told that some of the early church fathers took it as "manufacturing images for worship," an interesting point but strangely removed from what it might actually have meant in 8th century Israel. The commentary in such moments seems to offer little insight either on Hosea itself or the setting and audience of B.

These, however, are criticisms with the macro-level of the series and the volume: what the book is *not* rather than what it *is*. It *is* a wonderful piece of scholarship, offering technical and detailed comments on the Greek text of Hosea in B. The strength of the commentary lies in lexical and grammatical work that can often be difficult for non-specialists to find. If one picks up the work hoping for added insights into Hosea then, aside from an interesting point or two along the way, it will make for somewhat disappointing reading. But the work succeeds in nudging LXX scholarship into the broader public and allowing for more responsible use of the LXX by specialists and non-specialists alike. And for that reason alone this work will find itself at the elbow of LXX scholars generally, and commentators on the MT of Hosea for many years to come.

Joshua Moon
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Michael McClenahan. *Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012. 218 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1409441786. $99.95 (Hardback).

Recent years have witnessed considerable debate regarding Jonathan Edwards's understanding of justification. Revisionist scholars such as Anri Morimoto, Sang Lee, Robert Jenson, and Gerald McDermott have argued that Edwards departed from a traditional Reformed understanding of justification and at least opened the door to a more Catholic view of the doctrine. In response, a growing number of neo-traditionalist scholars have attempted to reassert Edwards's status as a faithful, albeit creative Reformed theologian. Several of the North American neo-traditionalists contributed to a recent collection of essays, edited by Josh Moody, titled *Jonathan Edwards and Justification* (Crossway, 2012). Irish pastor-theologian Michael McClenahan's further advances their work in his recent monograph *Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith*.

McClenahan argues that Edwards affirmed a traditionally Reformed view of justification that was informed by the milieu of the wider Reformed Orthodoxy movement and the immediate context of the Arminian controversy in eighteenth-century New England. Contra scholars influenced by Perry Miller who suggest that Arminianism represented an aberrant form of Calvinism that arose almost inevitably from covenant theology, McClenahan contends that the Arminianism opposed by Edwards has its roots in a different context: the post-Restoration Church of England. The main proponent of Arminianism was John Tillotson, the Archbishop of Canterbury from 1691 to 1694 and popularizer of anti-Calvinist sentiments among British Anglicans. When Timothy Cutler, rector of Yale University, converted to Anglicanism and embraced Tillotson's version of Arminianism in 1720, Edwards became engaged in the debate, beginning with his M.A. *Quaestio* (thesis) that year. His major work proved to be the treatise *Justification by Faith Alone* (1738), which was an expanded version of two lectures on the topic first delivered at Edwards's church in 1734. Based upon scattered footnotes and un-cited quotations and paraphrases, McClenahan shows that the major opponent in this apologetic work was Archbishop Tillotson.

McClenahan's book is not a comprehensive study of Edwards's views, but rather offers an analysis of Edwards's anti-Arminian polemic in the 1720s and 1730s, with special emphasis on *Justifica-*

tion by Faith Alone. He divides his monograph into five chapters plus a lengthy introduction and brief conclusion. The introduction provides a literature survey, criticizes revisionist understandings of Edwards on justification, and, most importantly, explains McClenahan's methodology. Rather than interpreting Edwards as a philosopher and granting his unpublished and often-speculative "Miscellanies" undue influence, McClenahan envisions Edwards as primarily a preacher and theologian and relies on his published treatises and sermons; many of the latter were revised from the Miscellanies. Chapters one and two explain the historical context of the New England debate over Arminianism and its background in the post-Restoration British Anglicanism of Tillotson. Edwards was not an esoteric philosopher flirting with Catholicism (or Eastern Orthodoxy), but rather was a theological polemicist countering a particular movement he understood to be erroneous. Chapters three, four, and five provide an exposition of *Justification by Faith Alone* that set the discourse in its polemical context and frame the work as representative of Reformed Orthodox thinking on justification, righteousness, and evangelical obedience.

In making his case for Edwards as a defender of Reformed theology and piety, McClenahan ably demonstrates that revisionists are largely unfamiliar with the British debates over Arminianism and the finer theological distinctions made by the leading theologians of Reformed Orthodoxy, especially Francis Turretin, whom Edwards regularly quotes. Revisionists, many of whom seem to be largely motivated by ecumenical concerns or trendy theological movements such as the New Perspective on Paul, fail to understand Edwards in his own context on his own terms. Furthermore, by focusing on Edwards's unpublished theorizing rather than his published beliefs, they overemphasize his unsettled speculations over his publicly articulated convictions. Their misunderstanding or outright ignorance of the interpretive tradition of Reformed Orthodoxy lead them to accuse Edwards of flirting with views that he flatly condemned as opposed to his understanding of the gospel. McClenahan has done scholars (and pastors) a favor by providing the historical legwork to demonstrate that traditional interpretations of Edwards's views are substantially correct.

Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith originated as a doctoral thesis at Exeter College, Oxford University. As such, it reads like a dissertation at times, including repetition (e.g. pp. 43 and 58) and the occasional use of the word "dissertation" rather than more ap-

propriate terms such as "book," "study," or "monograph." It is also necessarily limited in its scope, in this case to the 1720s and 1730s. While McClenahan rightly points out that Edwards never published a comprehensive treatise on justification (there is an unfinished draft in the Edwards corpus), with the availability of the Yale Edition of Edwards's works, there is a need for a historical inquiry into any post-1738 developments in Edwards's thinking on justification, especially in sermons and passing references in other published works. One hopes McClenahan's fine monograph will inspire an intrepid doctoral student or seasoned Edwardsean scholar to engage in just such a study.

Nathan A. Finn
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Dominique Barthélemy. *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project*. Textual Criticism and the Translator. 3. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012. xxxii + 688. Hardback. ISBN 978-1575062358. $79.50 (Hardback).

Dominique Barthélemy's book, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project* is a translation from three French introductory chapters, which constitute the introductions to each of the three volumes of Barthélemy's *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (CTAT). CTAT itself is the fruition of the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project, (HOTTP) a collaboration of six Old Testament textual critics, initiated by the United Bible Society under the leadership of the now famous Eugene Nida, as a means to help translators apply the results of text criticism to their work around the globe.

Barthélemy was already well known in the field of text criticism having helped to edit and publish the Cave One fragments from Qumran and later, the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever. His participation in HOTTP further prepared him to write CTAT and seal his place in Old Testament text criticism.

Studies in the Text of the Old Testament is divided into three sections, each corresponding to one of the introductions to CTAT, noted above. In addition, one of the six participants of HOTTP, James Sanders, writes an introduction to the present volume in which he situates the work of Barthélemy and HOTTP within current Old Testament text critical efforts.

Part One expresses a history of Old Testament textual criticism from the early medieval period (c. A.D. 840) until J. D. Michaelis at the end of the 18th century. Barthélemy also articulates the work of the committee and the how it initially envisioned its tasks and goals.

Part Two leads the reader through the different modern versions that HOTTP consulted and their own histories, influences, and revisions.

Part Three is divided into three portions: An Introduction expresses the methodology and purpose in the pursuit of a critical edition of the Hebrew Bible. Section One traces the authority of the highest-caliber, Masoretic, medieval manuscripts in conjunction with the process of how these manuscripts came into being. In addition, it traces the progression of a text type aligned with the Masoretic text (Proto-Masoretic), a textual tradition prior to the Masoretic text type (Pre-Masoretic), and one beyond a Masoretic stabilization (Extra-Masoretic). Finally, Section Two discusses the origin and development of ancient versions alongside Hebrew manuscripts.

Barthélemy's work exhibits an erudition and methodological rigor that immediately demonstrates his long-standing work in the field. By way of example, Barthélemy writes in Part One that the committee itself "recognized four phases in the development of the Hebrew text." The first phase consisted of the original oral or written literary materials. Barthélemy asserts that literary analysis would be necessary to pursue the constitution of these sources. The second phase consisted of what the committee called the earliest attested text. This evidence would necessarily be textual in nature and would require textual evidence for support. The third phase consisted of the proto-Masoretic text and the fourth stage is the Masoretic text (p. 87). This sort of clarity at the beginning of the committee's work demonstrates why the project was successful and upon what foundation Barthélemy is able to articulate these and other issues in the remaining introductions.

Another example of erudition concerns Barthélemy's distinction of Canonical Scriptures in contrast to what he calls "Holy Scripture" (p. 229). Canonical Scripture is a particular text regulated by authoritative paradigmatic texts. Holy Scripture, in contrast, "can constitute a legacy held by a relatively closed school, where the Scripture evolves by additions, alterations, and omissions to keep current the divine message which it transmits and which must retain its value for future generations" (p. 229). Barthélemy proceeds

with the example of Deuteronomy, in so far as it was scripture before its so-called canonization in the period of Josiah. Then, after the collapse of the state, it became Holy Scripture again with the necessity of development for its constituents and then finally, achieving canonical status thereafter.

However, the book does suffer from a few minor deficiencies, mainly stemming from the manner in which it is compiled. Parts One through Three are distinct introductions to different volumes, so they do not flow seamlessly. Some ideas are repeated or developed throughout the work of the committee. Although Barthélemy, along with Sanders (in his introduction to the work), attempts to alert the reader to these issues, some confusion is inevitable. Also, at various places, Barthélemy discusses the most detailed of minutiae (e.g. details of the Masorah Parva). At times, these detailed materials may be beyond the reach of the interested general reader, or even of the young scholar who has not delved into such areas. Perhaps a glossary or subject index could make the work more useful to these readers. Finally, Part Two, fascinating though it is to a reader interested in the history of these modern translations, appears less related to the application of textual criticism.

These minor criticisms aside, I found the material in Parts One and Three exhilarating. At times, I felt as though I was learning from the scholar himself, safeguarding his analysis with methodological succinctness while profoundly pointing out the obvious from his first-hand study of sources.

Tracy McKenzie
Wake Forest, North Carolina