

# Journal *for* BAPTIST THEOLOGY & MINISTRY

FALL 2019 • VOLUME 16, NUMBER 2



# Journal *for* BAPTIST THEOLOGY & MINISTRY

FALL 2019 • Vol. 16, No. 2

The Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry  
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary

**NOBTS President**  
James K. Dew, PhD

**NOBTS Provost**  
Norris Grubbs, PhD

**Editor & BCTM Director**  
Adam Harwood, PhD

**Research Assistant**  
Hoyt Denton

**Book Review Editors**  
Archie England, PhD  
Dennis Phelps, PhD

## 2019 EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

**Bart Barber, PhD**  
First Baptist Church of Farmersville, Texas

**Rex Butler, PhD**  
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary

**Nathan Finn, PhD**  
North Greenville University

**Eric Hankins, PhD**  
First Baptist Fairhope, Fairhope, Alabama

**Malcolm Yarnell, PhD**  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

**The Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry** is a research institute of New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. The seminary is located at 3939 Gentilly Blvd., New Orleans, LA 70126.

BCTM exists to provide theological and ministerial resources to enrich and energize ministry in Baptist churches. Our goal is to bring together professor and practitioner to produce and apply these resources to Baptist life, polity, and ministry. The mission of the BCTM is to develop, preserve, and communicate the distinctive theological identity of Baptists.

**The Journal for Baptist Theology and Ministry** is published semiannually by the Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry. Copyright ©2019 The Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. All Rights Reserved. This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database® (ATLA RDB®), <http://www.atla.com>.

**CONTACT BCTM**  
(800) 662-8701, ext. 8074  
[baptistcenter@nobts.edu](mailto:baptistcenter@nobts.edu)  
[www.baptistcenter.com](http://www.baptistcenter.com)

**SUBMISSIONS**  
Visit the [Baptist Center website](#) for submission guidelines.



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Introduction Adam Harwood	1
The Holy Spirit's Work According to Peter the Lombard's <i>Four Books of Sentences</i> Thomas P. Johnston	2
Did the Incarnation Introduce Change among the Persons of the Trinity? Adam Harwood	37
Unconditional Election and the Condemnation of Sinners: An Analysis of Eric Hankin's View of Reprobation Daniel Kirkpatrick	47
"Worse than Idle" or "Mysteries of the Gospel": John Albert Broadus and Benjamin Keach on Interpreting and Preaching the Parables of Jesus H. Jared Bumpers	57
Book Reviews	74

---

---

# Editorial Introduction



**Adam Harwood, PhD**

*Adam Harwood is professor of theology, occupying the McFarland Chair of Theology; director of the Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry; and editor, Journal for Baptist Theology and Ministry at New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary.*

---

This issue offers four articles from the fields of biblical, historical, and theological studies. Thomas P. Johnston, professor of evangelism at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, examines Peter Lombard's view of the Holy Spirit based on his writings, which have been locked in the Latin language for 850 years. In the next article, I argue from the New Testament—while observing historical and theological boundaries—that the incarnation of the Word introduced change among the persons of the Trinity. Daniel Kirkpatrick, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of the Southwest, assesses Eric Hankins's view of the doctrine of reprobation then argues one can affirm unconditional election without affirming reprobation. H. Jared Bumpers, assistant professor of preaching and ministry at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, compares the approaches of John Broadus and Benjamin Keach on interpreting and preaching Jesus's parables then concludes with lessons for contemporary preachers. These articles are followed by a selection of book reviews in the fields of biblical, historical, and theological studies. May these articles and book reviews stimulate readers to give careful attention to their life and doctrine (1 Tim 4:16).

## The Holy Spirit's Work According to Peter the Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences*



Thomas P. Johnston, PhD

*Thomas P. Johnston is professor of evangelism at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Kansas City, Missouri.*

tjohnston@mbts.edu

**Note:** A version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society in Denver, Colorado, on November 13, 2018.

Beginning with Anselm of Laon (c. 1050–1117), European schoolmasters began to glean through and gather the sayings of earlier theologians into Sentences. These Sentences included glosses on Scripture often from the context of rhetorical prose against one heresy or another. The Sentences became class notes in the new field of “theology,” as schoolmasters taught their students the sacred arts, leveraging the doctrine of God to frame their views. The era of the Sentences lasted approximately one hundred years. Of all the gatherings of the sentences, the *Four Books of Sentences* of Peter Lombard (1096–1160) achieved the pinnacle of success. His *Four Books* framed western church theology, leaving an imprint that formalized elements of Roman Catholic doctrine to this day. In response to the issues of his day, Lombard created a non-Evangelical theological basis, much to the detriment of the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences* inaugurated a new age in academia. First, after his death in 1160, Lombard's *Sentences* framed topics for the new science of systematic theology. Second, his *Sentences* replaced the direct study of Scripture for doctrinal formation. Third, the *Four Books of Sentences* formalized Catholicism's sacramental soteriology. Fourth, use of Lombard's *Sentences* spread concurrently to the formation of universities in western Europe.<sup>1</sup> In the thirteenth century, Lombard's *Sentences* became the doctrinal gathering place for minds in every western university. Not only were his sentences pondered, but schoolmen had to write a commentary on Lombard's *Sentences* in order to receive a teaching position. Hence, Martin Luther (1483–1546) wrote his commentary in 1508—350 years after Lombard authored them.<sup>2</sup> Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) wrote his commentary on Lombard's

<sup>1</sup>Prior to the twelfth century, formal education in western Europe was vested mainly in the church, either in Cathedral schools or in monasteries.

<sup>2</sup>“As for Luther, he regretted that he had received a scholastic education as a young person: ‘I was compelled to read the devil's rubbish, the scholastic philosophers and sophists with such cost, labor, and detriment, from which I have had trouble enough to rid myself’” (John D. Woodbridge and Frank A. James III, *Church History*, vol 2, “From the Reformation to the Present Day” [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2013], 100). François Lambert of Avignon wrote of his errors as a Strict Franciscan

*Sentences* in 1252–1254. Bonaventura (1221–1274), perhaps the most famous commentators on Lombard, wrote his commentary in 1250–1252. Virtually every schoolmaster had to write a commentary on the *Four Books of Sentences* in order to achieve the degree of master; their master's degree was specifically tied to the mastery of Master Peter's *Four Books of Sentences*! Pope Benedict XVI explained, "Lombard's text was the book in use at all schools of theology until the 16th century."<sup>3</sup>

The novelty of Lombard's *Sentences* did not wane with the arrival of the Summas. Soon after the century of the *Sentences*, Summas made their appearance. The Franciscans had their *Summa Halensis* (1245), and the Dominican Thomas Aquinas wrote his *Summa Theologica* (1266).<sup>4</sup> So, while the *Sentences* continued to shape the academic discipline of theology, the Summas marked a growing differentiation into other fields of theological inquiry. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, theological chairs were established in universities to teach the particular doctrinal categories of various theologians, such as Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, or Duns Scotus.<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, during the eleventh to fourteenth centuries, ministerial formation made massive shifts:

1. From the study of Scripture to the study of glosses on Scripture (in their context);
2. From the study of glosses on Scripture (in their context) to *Sentences* gathered topically from those glosses;
3. From the topical gatherings of *Sentences* to more pragmatic Summas on various topics;
4. From the pragmatic Summas to doctrinal schools based on those Summas.

Even with all these changes, there was one fixed point. All of these schoolmen were constrained to adhere to Lombard's view of the Trinity and his seven sacraments. Further,

---

prior to his conversion to Lutheranism, "J'ai confiance en Celui qui m'a retiré d'une captivité plus dure que celle d'Egypte, que je réparerai avec son divin secours par mes paroles et par mes livres mes nombreuses erreurs." ["I have confidence in Him who removed me from a captivity more difficult than that of Egypt, that I will repair with His divine help by my words and by my books my numerous errors" ](François Lambert d'Avignon, "Histoire du moine racontée par lui-même, traduite du latin" [Story of a monk told by he himself, translated from Latin], in Franck Puaux, *Histoire de la Réformation Française* [1523; Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1859], 1:417; taken from Gerdesius, *Historia christianismi renovati*, vol IV; translation mine).

<sup>3</sup>Benedict XVI, General Audience: "Peter Lombard" (Rome, 30 Dec 2009), available at [https://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/audiences/2009/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_aud\\_20091230.html](https://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/audiences/2009/documents/hf_ben-xvi_aud_20091230.html), accessed 10 Nov 2018.

<sup>4</sup>Marc Ozilou, "Introduction générale"; in Pierre Lombard, *Les Quatre Livres des Sentences: Premier Livre*; trans. by Marc Ozilou (Paris: Cerf, 2012), 42.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

Lombard’s Sentences became co-equal to Scripture, becoming the inerrant “Traditions” of the church.<sup>6</sup> In reality, as they stood as an approved interpreter of Scripture, the hermeneutical approach of Lombard, in reality, superseded Scripture.<sup>7</sup>

Connaissance de l'Écriture sainte et statut social d'après Armand de Belvézer, Qdl. 26

statut canonique	laïcs	clercs	curés	prélats et religieux
alphabétisation	illettrés	lettrés	lettrés	lettrés
objets	articles de foi commandements	articles de foi commandements	articles de foi commandements sacrements	articles de foi commandements sacrements théologie Écriture sainte
degrés	implicite totale explicite partielle	implicite totale explicite totale	implicite totale explicite totale	implicite totale explicite totale
modalités			démonstrative	démonstrative subtile <i>in habitu</i> (toujours) <i>in actu</i> (parfois)

Figure 1.<sup>8</sup>

One sad result of Lombard’s distinction between the laity and the clergy was the removal of Scripture from the laity’s grasp. Paulette L’Hermit-Leclercq explained,

It is time to turn to the other side of the barrier that separated the masters of the Word and simple laypersons.

For the Christian who had no access to the Latin of the Bible, promoted as the language of God, neither even on several passages that were translated into their language, they were asked to listen to the clerics, and to believe and respect their commandments. An eminent theologian from the Sorbonne in the 13<sup>th</sup> Century, Simon of Tournai affirmed “that which the scholar knows the simple must believe.”<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Fourth Lateran Council, Canon 2; in Heinrich Denzinger, Peter Hünermann (ed., original edition), and Joseph Hoffmann (ed., French edition), *Symboles et définitions de la foi catholique: Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 38<sup>th</sup> ed. (37<sup>th</sup> ed., Freiburg: Herder, 1997; Paris: Cerf, 2005), §803; henceforth cited as “DS” with the section number.

<sup>7</sup>“This supernatural revelation, according to the belief of the universal Church, is contained both in unwritten Tradition, and in written Books, which are therefore called sacred and canonical because, “being written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author and as such have been delivered to the Church” (Leo XIII, Providentissimus Deus [Rome: 18 Nov 1893], §1, available at <http://www.catholic-forum.com/saints/pope0256b.htm>, accessed 8 Mar 2002.

<sup>8</sup>Martin Morard, “Sacrée Parole! Exégèse, Écriture sainte et Parole de Dieu d’après Dominique Grima et Armand de Belvézer, O.P.,” in *La Parole Sacrée: Formes, fonctions, sens (XIe–XVe siècle)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 47 (Toulouse, France: Éditions Privat, 2013), 432.

<sup>9</sup>“Il est temps de passer de l’autre côté de la barrière qui sépare les maîtres de la Parole et les

Martin Morard depicted the resulting revelatory polarization in the thirteenth century. Morard charted the prescribed study of Scriptures by comparing four groups of persons: laypersons, clerics, priests, prelates, and monks (see Figure 1). The study of the Holy Scriptures was reserved only for the highest group, the prelates and monks. Pope Clement XIII later reaffirmed this same principle in 1761, “The faithful should obey the apostolic advice not to know more than is necessary, but to know in moderation.”<sup>10</sup>

The scholastic transition described above from Scripture to glosses on Scripture to sentences to doctrinal summaries led to the total removal of Scriptures from the laity. Such was depicted in a thirteenth-century Medieval commentary on Daniel in the Occitan language written by the spiritual Franciscan Barthélemy Sicard,

Interpreting the most meager allusions to Babylonian science, Barthélemy denounces as soon as he can, with an even greater vehemence, the “Parisian masters, drunk with pagan errors or adhering excessively to human opinions.” At times he evidences a great precision in his criticism, for example in identifying the point of departure in the modern subversion of theology. Thereby, “the captivity of the Holy Jerusalem by the King of Babylon should be understood as the submission . . . of the contemplation and the peace which existed in the times of the ancient doctors up until the era of Anselm, of Richard and of Bernard, in the study of the Holy Scriptures,” Peter Lombard, *magister Sententiarum*, was notably held responsible for the introduction of philosophical arguments into theology to the detriment of the reading of the Holy Text.<sup>11</sup>

---

simples laïcs.

“Au chrétien qui n’a accès ni au latin de la Bible, posé comme la langue de Dieu, ni même aux quelques passages qui sont traduits dans sa langue, l’on demande d’écouter les clercs, de croire et de respecter les commandements. Un éminent théologien de la Sorbonne du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, Simon de Tournai, affirmait que ‘ce que le savant sait le simple doit le croire.’” (Paulette L’Hermite-Leclercq, “Conclusion,” in *La Parole Sacrée: Formes, Fonctions, sens [XI<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle]*, 529; translation mine).

<sup>10</sup>Clement XIII, *In Dominico Agro: On Instruction in the Faith* (14 June 1761), §3, available at <http://www.ewtn.com/library/ENCYC/C13INDOM.HTM>, accessed 8 Sept 2004.

<sup>11</sup>“Tirant parti des moindres allusions à la science babyloniennes, Barthélemy dénonce dès qu’il le peut, avec une véhémence plus grande encore, les ‘maîtres parisiens, imbus des erreurs païennes ou adhérant excessivement aux opinions humaines.’ Il se montre parfois d’une grande précision dans sa critique, par exemple en identifiant le point de départ de la subversion moderne de la théologie. Ainsi, ‘la captivité de la sainte Jérusalem par le roi de Babylone doit être comprise comme la soumission . . . de la contemplation et de la paix qui existait du temps des anciens docteurs jusqu’à l’époque d’Anselme, de Richard et de Bernard, dans l’étude sacrée des écritures saintes.’ Pierre Lombard, *magister Sententiarum* étant nommément tenu pour responsable de l’introduction d’argumentations philosophiques en théologie au détriment de la lecture du text sacré” (Sylvain Piron, “La critique de l’Église chez les Spirituels languedociens” in *L’anticalisme en France méridionale (milieu XIII<sup>e</sup>–début XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 38* [Toulouse, France: Éditions Privat, 2003], 95; translation mine). Piron wrote this paper on the Franciscan, Barthélemy Sicard, described as “*Définit*eur of the general chapter of the Province of Provence” in 1309 by Pope Clement V, who wrote a commentary on Daniel in the Languedoc language (of Southern France).

This bleak context explained the role of Lombard's *Sentences* in the development of Roman Catholic doctrine. Perhaps it was for reasons of scholastic concealment that the *Four Books of Sentences* remained cocooned in the Latin language for 850 years.

However, in the third millennium of the church, access to Lombard has changed for the English-speaking world, as well as for the French. The Franciscan Archive began uploading an English translation of Peter the Lombard's *Four Book of Sentences*, complete with a critical apparatus.<sup>12</sup> Within two years, The Franciscan Archives halted its work at Book 2, Distinction 37 (of the 45 total distinctions). Meanwhile, the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies (PIMS) at the University of Toronto began to publish its own non-critical translation of Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences*. These translations by Giulio Silano were published by PIMS in hard copy editions in 2007, 2008, 2008, and 2010 respectively.<sup>13</sup> Beginning in 2012, the French also translated and published Lombard. Their four Books, translated by Mark Ozilou, were published by *Les Édition du Cerf* in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 respectively.<sup>14</sup> These translations lifted approximately 850 years of ignorance for non-Latin readers.

The observant historian need only look at several reference books to consider that Lombard and most of Medieval church history is virtually unconsidered in English doctrinal anthologies. John R. Leith's *Creeeds of the Churches* traversed 741 years in 4 pages (or 0.054% of the 736-page book),<sup>15</sup> that being, from the 787 Council of Nicaea to 1528 Ten Conclusions of Bern, averaging one page for 185 years. Philip Schaff's *Creeeds of Christendom*, volume 1, crossed from the Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787) and the pseudo-Athanasian Creed (8<sup>th</sup>–9<sup>th</sup> century) to the Confessions of Gennadius (1453), then landing in the sixteenth century.<sup>16</sup> In his second volume, Schaff continued in the same vein, moving from “The Creed of the Sixth Oecumenical Council against the Monothelites” (680) to the “Canons

<sup>12</sup>“Peter Lombard's *Sententiarum Liber Primus: De Dei Unitate et Trinitate*; available at: <https://franciscan-archive.org/lombardus/I-Sent.html>, accessed 21 Oct 2018.

<sup>13</sup>Peter Lombard, *The Sentences: Book 1, The Mystery of the Trinity*; trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: PIMS, 2007); *The Sentences: Book 2, On Creation*; trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: PIMS, 2008); *The Sentences: Book 3, On the Incarnation of the Word*; trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: PIMS, 2008); *The Sentences: Book 4, On the Doctrine of Signs*; trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: PIMS, 2010). Henceforth, the four books of sentences translated by Silano will be abbreviated as “Lombard [Eng].”

<sup>14</sup>Pierre Lombard, *Les Quatre Livres: Premier Livre; Les Quatre Livres des Sentences: Deuxième Livre*; trans. Marc Ozilou (Paris: Cerf, 2013); *Les Quatre Livres des Sentences: Troisième Livre*; trans. Marc Ozilou (Paris: Cerf, 2014); *Les Quatre Livres des Sentences: Quatrième Livre*; trans. Marc Ozilou (Paris: Cerf, 2015). Henceforth, the four books of sentences translated by Ozilou will be abbreviated as “Lombard [Fr].”

<sup>15</sup>Leith discussed Canon 1 and 21 of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) and several paragraphs from the 1438–1445 Council of Florence on the Sacraments (John H. Leith, *Creeeds of the Churches*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. [Atlanta: John Knox, 1982], vii–viii).

<sup>16</sup>Philip Schaff, *Creeeds of Christendom*, vol 1, “The History of the Creeeds,” rev. ed. David S. Schaff (1931; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983), xi–xii.

and Dogmatic Decrees of the Council of Trent” (1563), a jump of 883 years.<sup>17</sup> Meanwhile, the earliest creed in Schaff’s 3<sup>rd</sup> volume, “The Evangelical Protestant Creeds, with Translations” was a paraphrase of the 67 Articles of Ulrich Zwingli (1523).<sup>18</sup> The Dark Ages were made much darker by such stark omissions of available material.

On the other hand, Bettenson and Maunder, *Documents of the Christian Church*, retained Medieval doctrinal material. They cited Anselm and Aquinas but included no material from Lombard.<sup>19</sup> Recently, James T. Dennison greatly improved on Schaff’s selectivity by including a translation of the entire “Sixty-Seven Articles of Huldrych Zwingli” (1523), as well as the “Waldensian Confession” (1530) and the “Waldensian Synod of Chanforan” (1532).<sup>20</sup> It may be that the newly published *Sentences* of Lombard will allow English-speaking Evangelical theologians to correct the primary source gaps in Schaff’s and Leith’s works.

In this paper, I will not focus on neither whether Lombard properly cited Augustine or on his use of pseudo-Augustine.<sup>21</sup> Also, I will not evaluate the translation styles of Marc Ozilou, Giulio Silano, or translators of The Franciscan Archive. I cannot cover all the many intricately-woven topics in the *Sentences*. Also, I will not address Lombard’s impact on the organization of subsequent courses in doctrine, on topics covered in church history, or on western post-Lombard ministerial curricula. These investigations will have to be made by those who now have access to the works of Lombard in English and French.

<sup>17</sup>Philip Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol 2, “The Greek and Latin Creeds, vi–vii.

<sup>18</sup>Philip Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol 3, “The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches,” v–vi.

<sup>19</sup>Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder, eds., *Documents of the Christian Church*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), xvi–xvii.

<sup>20</sup>James T. Dennison Jr., *Reformed Confessions of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Centuries in English Translation: Vol 1, 1523–1552* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage, 2008), vii.

<sup>21</sup>The Franciscan Archive’s translation included a disclaimer in its first footnote of Book 1, Distinction 1, Chapter 1, related to a Lombard’s citation of Augustine’s “On Christian Doctrine”: “Chapter 2, n. 2; here and in the next passage, but with many words omitted by Master (Peter) and not a few added or changed” (“Chapter 1: Every doctrine concerns things and/or signs”; from <http://www.franciscan-archive.org/lombardus/opera/l1-01.html>, accessed 16 May 2006). For example, the following footnotes delineate scribal errors and omissions from citations of Augustine in Bk 1, D 1, c 3: “*On Christian Doctrine*, Bk. I, ch. 33, n. 37; the next passage *ibid.*, ch. 31, n. 34. [Trans. Here in both the Latin and English this phrase has been offset from the passage quoted by quotes, seemingly omitted in the Quarrachi edition by a typographical lapse.]. *Loc. cit.*, ch. 33. n. 37. [Trans. Again, the quote at the beginning of this passage, omitted from the Latin text, by typographical lapse, is restored in both the Latin and English texts].— At the end of this quote all the codices and editions 1 and 8, have *in* before *the most high*; but below, near the of the same passage from St. Augustine only codex B, with the same two editions has this. But since *in* is lacking in the original, we have changed nothing. <sup>7</sup>Bk. I, ch. 22, but very many words have be excerpted according to the sense. — Next, all the manuscripts and editions 1 and 8, badly and against the text of (St.) Augustine, omit *us* at *console*” (*ibid.*).

In this paper, I will focus on how Lombard approached the person and work of the Holy Spirit. To address the work of the Holy Spirit in Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences* is to address his context. Therefore, I will begin with a look at Lombard's context. I will continue by noting how Lombard's Sentences addressed matters related to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Finally, I will end with some concluding comments related to specific emphases within Evangelicalism.

### Peter Lombard and His Patron, Bernard of Clairvaux

Very little is known about the early life of "Peter the Lombard." He was born sometime between 1095 and 1100 near Novara in Lombardy (northwestern Italy), in the village of Nomenonius or Lemononius.<sup>22</sup> His family name was not Lombard. The name is more of a title explaining that he descended from the Longobard people—which appellation was abbreviated to Lombard. It is assumed that he received his early schooling at the Cathedral of Novara with other children of his age. From there, he is said to have studied law in Bologna, Italy. But there is no firm evidence of these initial stages in Peter's schooling.<sup>23</sup> From Bologna, he desired to enhance his studies in the field of theology, which brought him to France.<sup>24</sup>

"Once arriving in France we have better knowledge of the life of Lombard."<sup>25</sup> Most important to Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences*, both doctrinally and pragmatically was Bernard of Clairvaux's patronage of Lombard. This care was memorialized in Bernard's 1134 (or 1136) letter to Hugh of Saint-Victor,

To the reverend fathers and lords, and to my very dear friends, to Gilduin, venerable Abbott of Saint-Victor in Paris by the grace of God, and to your entire assembly, brother Bernard of Clairvaux, greeting and all our wishes. – We necessarily have many things to ask, since many things are asked of us: and for certain friends, who do not show consideration of others, we cannot show them consideration. The Lord bishop of Lucques, our father and friend, has recommended to me Peter Lombard, venerable man, requesting me, for the time of his stay in France for his studies, to provide for a time for the necessities of his subsistence by our friends; which I have done while he lived in Rheims. Currently living in Paris, I recommend him to your charity, for it is from you that I expect even more, requesting that it will be agreeable to you for a short time to provide for his food, which needs to be done starting now up until the Nativity of the blessed Virgin Mary. Take care of yourself.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>22</sup>Marc Ozilou, "Introduction," in Lombard, *Les Quatre Livres: Premier Livre*, 11.

<sup>23</sup>Giulio Silano, "Introduction," in Lombard, *The Sentences: Book 1*, ix.

<sup>24</sup>M. A. Landerer, "Lombardus, Petrus" in *A Religious Encyclopaedia*, Philip Schaff, 1891.

<sup>25</sup>"Une fois arrivé en France, la vie de Lombard nous est mieux connue" (Marc Ozilou, "Introduction," 12; translation mine).

<sup>26</sup>"Aux révérends pères et seigneurs, et à mes amis très chers, à Gilduin, abbé vénérable de Saint-Victor à Paris par la grâce de Dieu, et à toute votre sainte assemblée, frère Bernard de Clairvaux, salut et tous nos vœux. – Nous avons nécessairement beaucoup de chose à demander, car beaucoup de choses nous sont demandées : et pour certains amis, qui ne se ménagent pas pour les autres, nous ne

Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences* were not birthed in a doctrinal and methodological vacuum; neither was its impact in a vacuum. The Abbott Bernard of Clairvaux (in the diocese of Lyons) became famous by solving the schism of anti-pope Anacletus in 1138.<sup>27</sup> He heard of Lombard's intellectual abilities and became his patron, sending him to Hugh of Saint Victor, as he etched out new doctrinal bases for the Catholic Church. As it turns out, one of the major losers in Lombard's work was the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

### Peter Lombard's Context

Among others, three issues drove the religious climate within the early-twelfth century Catholic Church, and especially Catholicism in France: (1) the call for crusades; (2) enforced clerical celibacy; (3) the rise of numerous non-Catholic spiritual movements. Jacques Dalarun wrote, "In the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> Century, it was under the fire of the cross of Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable that the South [of France] was assigned its heresy."<sup>28</sup> These movements were stimulated by preachers like Peter of Bruys (d. 1126) and the Monk Henry (d. 1145). Following the death of Lombard in 1160 and before the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), these non-Catholic renewal movements only expanded in southern France, increasing the need for Lombard's doctrinal reforms. The Orthodox Bishop Nicetas, from Bulgaria, arrived in Saint-Félix-de-Caraman in 1167. He anointed six Cathar bishops in 1167:

- Robert d'Épernon, Bishop of the Church of the French
- Sicard Cellerier, Bishop of Albi
- Marc de Lombardie, Bishop of the Church of Lombardie
- Bernard Raimond, Bishop of the Church of Toulouse

---

pouvons nous ménager. Le Seigneur évêque de Lucques, notre père et ami, m'a recommandé Pierre Lombard, homme vénérable, me priant, le temps de son séjour en France pour ses études, de pourvoir pour un temps aux nécessités de sa subsistance par nos amis ; ce que j'ai fait quand il vivait à Reims. Séjournant à présent à Paris, je le recommande à votre charité, car c'est de vous que j'attends le plus, priant qu'il vous agrée de pourvoir une courte durée à sa nourriture, ce qui est à faire dès maintenant jusqu'à la Nativité de la Bienheureuse vierge Marie. Porte-toi bien." (ibid., 12. Taken from Bernard de Clairvaux, *Lettre CXL* [PL 182, col. 619a]; translation mine).

<sup>27</sup>"Bernard devenu à ce moment un des tout premiers personnages de la chrétienté grâce à sa victoire toute récente dans le schisme d'Anaclet." ["Bernard became at this time one of the first persons of Christianity due to his recent victory in the schism of Anacletus"] (Michel Rubellin, *Église et société chrétienne d'Agobard à Valdès* [Lyon: Presses Universitaires, 2003], 427); translation mine.

<sup>28</sup>"Au milieu du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, c'est sous le feu croisé de Bernard de Clairvaux et de Pierre le Vénérable que le Midi est assigné à son hérésie" (Jacques Dalarun, "Conclusion," in *Évangile et évangélisme [XII<sup>e</sup>-XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle]*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 34 [Toulouse, France: Éditions Privat, 1999], 336; translation mine). Also see the excellent historiographic work of Monique Zerner-Chardavoine, *La croisade albigeoise* (Paris: Gallimard/Julliard, 1979).

- Guiraud Mercier, Bishop of the Church of Carcassonne
- Raimon de Casals, Bishop of Agen.<sup>29</sup>

The reorganized Cathar-Orthodox churches were fast multiplying in southern France.

Meanwhile, the conversion of Peter Waldo in 1173 and his preaching led to his expulsion from the Catholic church in 1181 by the newly-appointed Archbishop Jean of Bellesmains.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup>“En 1167 de l’Incarnation du Seigneur, au mois de mai, en ces jours-là l’Eglise de Toulouse amena le Pape (ou le Père) Nicétas au château de Saint-Félix, et une grande multitude d’hommes et de femmes de l’Eglise de Toulouse et des autres Eglises voisines s’y réunit pour recevoir le consolamentum que Monseigneur le Pape Nicétas se mit à conférer.

“Ensuite Robert d’Epernon, évêque de l’Eglise des Français vint avec son conseil. Marc de Lombardie vint de même avec son conseil. Sicard Cellierier évêque de l’Eglise d’Albi, vint avec son conseil. Bernard Cathala vint avec le conseil de l’Eglise de Carcassonne, et le conseil de l’Eglise d’Agen fut là.

“Tous réunis de façon innombrable, les hommes de l’Eglise de Toulouse voulurent avoir un évêque, et élirent Bernard Raimond. De même Bernard Cathala et le conseil de l’Eglise de Carcassonne, requis et invités par l’Eglise de Toulouse, et de l’avis, la volonté et la décision de Monseigneur Sicard Cellierier, élirent Guiraud Mercier. Les hommes d’Agenais élirent Raimond de Casals.

“Puis Robert d’Epernon reçut le consolamentum et l’ordination d’évêque de Monseigneur le Pape Nicétas pour qu’il soit évêque des Français.

“De même Sicard Cellierier reçut le consolamentum et l’ordination d’évêque pour qu’il soit évêque d’Albi.

De même Marc reçut le consolamentum et l’ordination d’évêque pour être évêque de l’Eglise de Lombardie.

De même Bernard Raimond reçut le consolamentum et l’ordination d’évêque pour être évêque de l’Eglise de Toulouse.

“De même Guiraud Mercier reçut le consolamentum et l’ordination d’évêque pour être évêque de l’Eglise de Carcassonne.

“Demême Raimond de Casals reçut le consolamentum et l’ordination d’évêque pour être évêque d’Agen.»  
Après quoi le pape Nicétas dit à l’Eglise de Toulouse: *‘Vous m’avez dit de vous dire si les coutumes des Eglises primitives étaient légères ou rigoureuses. Je vous dirai que les sept Eglises d’Asie ont été séparées et délimitées entre elles, et aucune d’elles ne faisait quoi que ce soit contre les droits de l’autre. Et les Eglises de Romanie, de Dragovitie, de Mélenguie, de Bulgarie et de Dalmatie sont séparées et délimitées, et aucune ne fait quoi que ce soit contre les droits de l’autre. Et ainsi elles ont la paix entre elles: faites de même’*” (“L’acte de naissance des évêchés Cathares: La charte de Niquinta, Saint-Félix, 1167,” available at <http://www.couleur-lauragais.fr/pages/journaux/2005/cl69/histoire.html>, accessed 21 Sept 2007.

<sup>30</sup>“Il a montré qu’à l’origine ils ne sont nullement hérétiques. Durant six ans, entre 1173 et 1179, Valdo et les siens sont utilisés par l’archevêque, Guichard de Pontigny, un cistercien, pour lutter contre le chapitre cathédral de Lyon. Après que Jean de Bellesmains a succédé au siège épiscopal, les vaudois sont définis hérétiques parce qu’ils refusent d’obéir à la règle faisant au laïcs interdiction de prêcher.” [“He (Michel Rubellin) showed that at their origin they were not-at-all heretical. During the six years, between 1173 and 1179, Waldo and his people were used by the Archbishop, Guichard of Pontigny, a Cistercian, to fight against the chapter of the Cathedral of Lyon. After Jean of Bellesmains

This expulsion (perhaps the result of a longstanding Cistercian-Carthusian struggle) only created another rival church in Southeastern France, that of the “Poor men of Lyons.”<sup>31</sup> In the final analysis, Lombard’s doctrinal redefinitions did not stem the waves of heresy. If anything, it fanned its flames. Nor did the formerly Waldensian Durand d’Osca’s reconversion to Catholicism, and the accompanying “Confession of Durand d’Osca” (1208), curb the onset of rival churches in southern France.<sup>32</sup> Eventually, the sword of the state was needed to extinguish the heretical blaze (as was called for in the Fourth Lateran Council).<sup>33</sup> Thus, crusades were preached, and Inquisition was established.

Henry of Clairvaux called for the first anti-Cathar crusade, which took place in 1181. A second crusade was called against the Cathars—renamed “Albigenses” by crusade preacher Jacques de Vitry in 1209.<sup>34</sup> This second Albigensian crusade took place from 1209–1227, originally led by Simon of Montfort and Dominic of Osma. Soon, King Louis VIII and Prince (Saint) Louis IX expanded their dominion by conquering and occupying Cathar

---

succeeded him in the episcopal seat, the Waldenses were defined as heretical because they refused to obey the regulation that prohibited lay persons from preaching”] (Jacques Dalarun, Round Table: “Évangélisme et hérésie,” in *Évangile et évangélisme [XIIe-XIIIe siècle]*, 246; translation mine). In this text Dalarun referred to Michel Rubellin, “Au temps où Valdès n’étais pas hérétique: hypothèses sur le rôle de Valdès à Lyon,” in *Inventer l’hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l’inquisition*, Monique Zerner, Collection du centre d’études médiévales de Nice, vol. 2 (Paris: C.I.D., 1998), 193–218; this chapter was republished in Michel Rubellin, *Église et société chrétienne d’Agobard à Valdès*, 455–99. In addition, Rubellin also published research from another manuscript from the Clairvaux Abbey which he dated to the years just after Peter Waldo’s conversion (c. 1174–1178). Hence, presumably, this becomes the oldest extant documentation on Waldo, in which the Cistercian Bishop of Lyons, Guichard of Pontigny, related Waldo’s conversion to the monks of the Clairvaux Abbey (ibid., “Valdès un ‘exemple’ à Clairvaux? Le plus ancien texte sur le début du pauvre de Lyon,” 501–26).

<sup>31</sup>Michel Rubellin in “l’église de Lyon et saint Bernard” (in his *Église et société chrétienne d’Agobard à Valdès*, 423–53) discussed the very strained relationship between Peter the Venerable, Carthusian Abbott, and Bernard of Clairvaux, Cistercian Abbott.

<sup>32</sup>“La profession de foi prescrite aux Vaudois” in Innocent III, *Eius exemplo*, to the Archbishop of Tarragon (18 Dec 1208), DS 790–97.

<sup>33</sup>“If however a temporal lord, required and instructed by the church, neglects to cleanse his territory of this heretical filth, he shall be bound with the bond of excommunication by the metropolitan and other bishops of the province. If he refuses to give satisfaction within a year, this shall be reported to the supreme pontiff so that he may then declare his vassals absolved from their fealty to him and make the land available for occupation by Catholics so that these may, after they have expelled the heretics, possess it unopposed and preserve it in the purity of the faith—saving the right of the suzerain provided that he makes no difficulty in the matter and puts no impediment in the way” (Canon 3, Fourth Lateran Council [1215]), available at <http://www.dailycatholic.org/history/12ecume1.htm>, accessed 8 Nov 2018.

<sup>34</sup>Jacques de Vitry . . . from 1210 to 1213 . . . was one of the most noted preachers of the crusade against the Albigenses” (“Jacques de Vitry,” in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, available at [http://www.catholicity.com/encyclopedia/j/jacques\\_de\\_vitry.html](http://www.catholicity.com/encyclopedia/j/jacques_de_vitry.html), accessed 17 May 2006).

territories<sup>35</sup>—as was promised in Canon 3 of the Fourth Lateran Council. While the crusades and inquisitions took place in the thirteenth century, the twelfth century provided the doctrinal basis for this major shift in the policies and procedures of the Catholic Church. At the top of Rome’s twelfth-century doctrinal developments stands Lombard’s *Four Books of Sentences*.

The reign of Pope Urban II (1088–1099) marked a missional shift in which Rome was overtly calling for crusades to “recapture the Holy Land.” Before that time, popes had been content with rewarding successful generals with the crown and title of Holy Roman Emperor. William the Conqueror, with the support of Rome and under the tutelage of the Abbott Lanfranc, left Normandy France in 1066, crossed the English Channel, and became the only person in European history to conquer the British Isles successfully. In 1095, one year before Lombard’s birth, Pope Urban II called for the first crusade to recapture the Holy Land from the Saracens. This call to arms led to the first of nine official crusades to the Holy Land beginning in 1095 and ending in 1272. Among these nine official crusades, Peter Lombard’s patron, Bernard of Clairvaux, was famous for preaching the Second Crusade in Germany in 1147–1149. Lombard was in the midst of a tumultuous crusading time within the western church. A brief analysis of the foundational doctrines buttressing the crusades demonstrates the doctrinal chasms dividing Catholicism from Evangelical Christianity.

### Lombard, Catholicism, and Evangelicalism

By way of definition, “Catholicism” in this paper describes the official teachings of the Church of Rome. It must be remembered that it was not until 1208 that the word “Roman” was added to the list of adjectives describing that church. It was first inserted in the “Confession of Durand of Osca,” when the Waldensian preacher was reconverting to the church of Rome:<sup>36</sup> “We believe with our whole heart and confess with our mouth one Church only, not that of the heretics, but the Holy Roman Church, catholic, apostolic, outside of which we believe that none is saved.”<sup>37</sup> Therefore, Catholicism is synonymous to the church of Rome.

---

<sup>35</sup>Zoé Oldenbourg, “Chronological Table,” in *The Massacre of Montségur*, Peter Green, trans (New York: Pantheon, 1962), 390–95; translation of *Le Bucher de Montségur* (Paris: Gallimard, 1959).

<sup>36</sup>Jean Gonnet and Amedeo Molnar, *Les Vaudois au Moyen Âge* (Torino: Claudiana, 1974), 5.

<sup>37</sup>“Nous croyons de notre cœur et confessons de notre bouche une seule Église, non celle des hérétiques, mais la sainte Église romaine, catholique, apostolique, en dehors de laquelle nous croyons que personne n’est sauvé”; DS 792; translation mine. Benedict XVI, as Josef Cardinal Ratzinger, highlighted this concept in the “Declaration” *Dominus Iesus* he authored as the “(82) SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL, Decree *Ad gentes*, 2. The famous formula *extra Ecclesiam nullus omnino salvatur* is to be interpreted in this sense (cf. FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL, Cap. 1. *De fide catholica*: DS 802). Cf. also the *Letter of the Holy Office to the Archbishop of Boston*: DS 3866–3872” (Josef Cardinal Ratzinger, *Dominus Iesus* [16 June 2000; 6 Aug 2000; just after the release of Amsterdam 2000 on 5 Aug 2000], note 82 to §20).

As to Peter the Lombard and Catholicism, Pope Benedict XVI (b. 1927) addressed Lombard in his General Audience “Peter Lombard” (30 Dec 2009). He reaffirmed Lombard’s role in teaching the seven Sacraments, linking it to Rome’s monopoly in dispensing the same:

And Peter explains: “She was formed neither as a dominator nor a slave of man but rather as his companion” (*Sentences* 3, 18, 3). Then, still on the basis of the Patristic teaching he adds: “The mystery of Christ and of the Church is represented in this act. Just as, in fact, woman was formed from Adam’s rib while he slept, so the Church was born from the sacraments that began to flow from the side of Christ, asleep on the Cross, that is, from the blood and water with which we are redeemed from sin and cleansed of guilt” (*Sentences* 3 [sic], 18, 4)  
 . . .

Among the most important contributions offered by Peter Lombard to the history of theology, I would like to recall his treatise on the sacraments, of which he gave what I would call a definitive definition: “precisely what is a sign of God’s grace and a visible form of invisible grace, in such a way that it bears its image and its cause is called a sacrament in the proper sense” (4, 1, 4). With this definition Peter Lombard grasps the essence of the sacraments: they are a cause of grace, they are truly able to communicate divine life. . . .

Peter the Lombard, moreover, explained that the sacraments alone objectively transmit divine grace and they are seven: Baptism, the Eucharist, Penance, the Unction of the sick, Orders and Matrimony (cf. *Sentences* 4, 2, 1).<sup>38</sup>

Hence, reaffirmed by Benedict XVI, Lombard’s writings were wholly Roman Catholic, and they likewise focused on the seven sacraments of that church.

To define Evangelical, we will consider the definition of B. B. Warfield (1851–1921), “That only is true evangelicalism, therefore, in which sounds clearly the double confession that all power exerted in saving the soul is from God, and that God in his saving operations acts directly upon the soul.”<sup>39</sup> Centuries earlier, Martin Luther affirmed the same divine emphasis focusing God’s operations of grace through his word, “As we have said, God never has dealt, and never does deal, with mankind at any time otherwise than by the word of promise. Neither can we, on our part, ever have to do with God otherwise than through faith in His word and promise.”<sup>40</sup> Philip Jakob Spener (1635–1705) would add the direct work of the Holy Spirit through the Word of God, “The Scripture . . . is a book which is not given over solely to reading, but also to the proper exegete and revealer, namely the Holy Spirit. Where the Spirit does not open the Scripture, the Scripture is not understood even though it is read.”<sup>41</sup> A question is clarified, from whence does the work of the Holy Spirit

<sup>38</sup>Benedict XVI, General Audience: “Peter Lombard” (Rome, 30 Dec 2009); Internet.

<sup>39</sup>Benjamin B. Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board, 1918), 20.

<sup>40</sup>Martin Luther, “The Pagan Servitude of the Church,” in *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings Edited and with Introduction*, ed. John Dillenberger, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961), 277.

<sup>41</sup>Philip Jacob Spener, “On the Necessary and Useful Reading of the Holy Scriptures,” in *Pietists: Selected Writings*, ed. Peter C. Erb (New York: Paulist, 1983), 72. Cited by Dennis McCallum, “Philip Jacob Spener’s Contribution to Protestant Ecclesiology”; available at: <https://www.xenos.org/essays/>

emanate? For Rome, it appears to be by the species of the sacraments from the hands of Catholic priests. For the Evangelical, it is by the mouth of Evangelical ministers preaching the word of God. A large gap divides Catholic and Evangelical soteriology. The Catholic notion of the work of the Holy Spirit stands far removed from that of the Evangelical movement. Interestingly, Warfield considered that Rome had replaced the role of the Holy Spirit with its church, “The Church has completely taken the place of the Spirit of God as the proximate source of grace, and the action of the divine Spirit in applying salvation is postponed to and made subject to the operations of the Church through its ordinances.”<sup>42</sup> When was this doctrinal divide regarding the person and work of the Holy Spirit fully consummated? The unequivocal focal source intensifying this soteriological chasm was Peter Lombard’s *Four Books of Sentence*.

While at St. Victor, Lombard sat under the teaching of Hughes of St. Victor. He often borrowed from and cited Hughes throughout his *Four Books of Sentences*. Hughes taught that there were up to 30 general sacraments, seven of them being principal (*septem principalia sacramenta*).<sup>43</sup> These sacraments provided non-Catholic movements their major objections to Catholicism. A study was needed to teach the validity of and necessity for the sacraments. Bernard of Clairvaux chose well when he recommended Peter Lombard to Saint-Victor.

As to sacramental pressures, Canon 3 of the 1119 Council of Toulouse gave an idea of the anti-sacramental teaching of the Monk Henry,

[Henry the Heretic] increased his critique against the Church to the point that the Council of Toulouse took aim at him in 1119: in effect, the 3rd canon condemns all those who “through false pretext of religion deny the Sacrament of the Body and the Blood of Christ, the baptism of children, the priesthood and all other ecclesiastical orders, as well as the alliances of legitimate marriages.”<sup>44</sup>

---

phillip-jacob-speners-contribution-protestant-ecclesiology#\_ftn105 (online); accessed 3 Nov 2018; Internet.

<sup>42</sup>Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation*, 79.

<sup>43</sup>T. A. Lacey, “Sacraments: Christian, Western,” in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner’s, 1928), 905. “It is not pretended that the number [seven] is anywhere found expressed earlier than the 12<sup>th</sup> cent., when Otto of Bamberg introduced it [the seven sacraments] into a catechetical instruction for his Pomeranian converts (c. 1127), but he propounds it as an accepted tradition” (ibid.).

<sup>44</sup>“[Il] accentua sa critique contre l’Eglise au point d’être visé par le concile de Toulouse de 1119: en effet, le canon III condamne tous ceux qui ‘sous un faux semblant de religion nient le sacrement du corps et du sang du Christ, le baptême des enfants, le sacerdoce et tous les autres ordres ecclésiastiques, ainsi que les pactes des mariages légitimes” (Gonnet and Molnar, *Les Vaudois au Moyen Âge*, 35; translation mine). For their source on this council they cited C. J. von Hefele and H. LeClerq, *Histoire des Conciles*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1907–1921).

All four of these objections were deemed sacraments by Lombard. While none of the writings of the Monk Henry (d. 1148) have survived, the 1134 treatise of Peter the Venerable of Cluny (1092–1156) against the disciples of Henry of Lausanne has survived. In this treatise, Peter the Venerable further elaborated on five heretical propositions of Henry:

1. Refusal to baptize infants, under the pretext that it is faith that saves and that a young infant could not have sufficient conscience to believe.
2. Rejection of holy places; the Church of God does not consist of an assemblage of stones but of a spiritual reality, the communion of the faithful.
3. The cross is not an object of adoration; it is on the contrary a detestable object, as the instrument of the torture and suffering of Christ.
4. Priests and bishops dispense a lying teaching as to the matter of the Eucharist. The body of Christ was consumed only one time and only by the disciples, during the communion that preceded the Passion. All other later consumption is only vain fiction.
5. The funeral liturgy in its whole (offerings, prayers, Masses, and alms) is useless; the dead can hope in nothing more than what they received when they were alive.<sup>45</sup>

According to a timeline for the life of Peter Lombard, Peter the Venerable's treatise was written in 1134, the very year Lombard left Rheims for Paris. Peter Lombard was vetted and groomed to assist the Catholic Church during a time of disagreement over the sacraments, and he did not disappoint. Peter became a celebrated teacher at Notre Dame and was elevated to Bishop of Paris in 1159, one year before his death. He died in Paris on July 20, 1160.

During Lombard's early teaching ministry, the Council of Sens 1140/1141 condemned Peter Abelard as a heretic; Bernard of Clairvaux was his chief prosecutor. The accusations against Abelard could have been capital crimes, as evidenced by the burning of Arnald of

---

<sup>45</sup>1. Refus du baptême des enfants, sous le prétexte que c'est la foi qui sauve et qu'un jeune enfant ne saurait être suffisamment conscient pour croire.

“2. Rejet des lieux consacrés; l'Église de Dieu ne consiste pas en un assemblage de pierres mais en une pure réalité spirituelle, la communauté des fidèles.

“3. La Croix n'est pas un objet d'adoration; c'est au contraire un objet détestable, comme instrument de torture et de souffrance du Christ.

“4. Prêtres et évêques dispensent un enseignement mensonger en matière eucharistique. Le corps du Christ n'a été consommé qu'un fois et par les seuls disciples, lors de la Cène qui a précédé la Passion. Toute consommation ultérieure n'est que vaine fiction.

“5. La liturgie funéraire dans son ensemble (offrandes, prières, messes, aumônes) est inutile; le mort ne peut rien espérer d'autre que ce qu'il a obtenu de son vivant” (Dominique Iogna-Prat, “L'argumentation défensive: de la Polémique grégorienne au ‘Contra Petrobrusianos’ de Pierre le Vénéral,” in *Inventer l'hérésie*, ed. Monique Zerner, 88; translation mine).

Brescia in Rome (1145), Peter of Bruis in Paris (1145), and Henry the Monk in Paris (1147).<sup>46</sup> Four of the accusations against Abelard were casuistic restatements of objections against the teachings of the Monk Henry, as well as those of Peter of Bruis:<sup>47</sup>

7. God cannot [by the Sacrament of Infant Baptism] prevent evil.
8. In Adam we have not contracted sin, but only its penalty [On Original Sin as related to the Baptism of infants].
12. The power to loose and unloose was given only to the apostles and not to their successors [On the Sacrament of Penance].
13. That by works, man becomes not better but worse [Of Infant Baptism].<sup>48</sup>

An antagonism to certain sacraments came not only from those outside of Catholicism but also from inside Catholicism, as was also the case with the Waldensian movement.

Even the anti-Henry rhetoric of Bernard of Clairvaux appeared a complete exaggeration as described by Monique Zerner,

The canon [of Mans] inspired him [Bernard] to accuse [Henry] of cupidity and an allusion of nocturnal debauchery, even as these themes follow a common thread with the propaganda unleached against Anaclete. The letter is a long diatribe as Bernard of Clairvaux was capable of writing against his adversaries, of which A. Bredero wrote a searing description: for him “the judgment that he brought in 1144 on the heretic Henry of Lausanne in a letter sent to the Count of St. Gilles should be considered as an assertion without foundation.”<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup>Thieleman J. van Bracht, *The Bloody Theater or Martyrs Mirror of the Defenseless Christians Who Baptized Only Upon Profession of Faith...*, trans. Joseph F. Sohm (1660; 1748; 1837; 1853; reprint, Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 2007), 274.

<sup>47</sup>“1. That children may not be baptized or saved through the faith of another; but that they must be baptized and saved through their own faith; for baptism without individual faith saves no one.

“2. That individual faith without baptism is useless.

“3. That children that have not yet reached the years of understanding, cannot be saved by the baptism of Christ.

“4. That those who have been baptized in infancy must, when they become older, be rebaptized, for this, he says, is not rebaptizing, but, much rather, baptizing aright.” (ibid.).

<sup>48</sup>“7. Dieu ne doit ni ne peut empêcher le mal.

“8. D’Adam nous n’avons pas contracté la faute, mais seulement la peine.

“12. Le pouvoir de lier et de délier a été donné seulement aux apôtres, et non à leurs successeurs.

“13. De par les œuvres, l’homme ne devient ni meilleur ni pire.” (“Erreurs de Pierre Abélard”; DS §§727, 728, 732, and 733). These points appear to be written both to confuse and to provide their authors plausible deniability.

<sup>49</sup>“Le chanoine lui aurait inspiré l’accusation de cupidité et l’allusion à des débauches nocturnes, encore que ces termes soient des lieux communs de la propagande déchainée contre Anaclet. La lettre est une longue diatribe comme Bernard était capable d’en faire contre ses adversaires, dont A.

Even so, Bernard's exaggerated denunciation was validated by a higher cause, the protection of the sacraments of the Catholic Church. In reality, the entire enterprise of the *Four Books of Sentences* appears framed to affirm the sacramental system of the Catholic Church as conceived by Bernard of Clairvaux.

### **Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences***

Written in four books, the *Sentences* are well adapted to academic life. They are set to coincide with four semesters of doctrinal studies, achievable in two years. Further, as they are class notes, the *Four Books of Sentences* provide tinder to facilitate rousing discussions for young minds. As to the central theme of Lombard's *Sentences*, he tipped his hand in Book 1, Distinction 1, Chapter 1,

While considering the contents of the Old and New Law again and again by diligent chase [indagine], the prevenient grace of God has hinted to us, that a treatise on the Sacred Page is [versari] chiefly about things and/or signs. For as Augustine, the egregious Doctor, says in the book *on Christian Doctrine*: "Every doctrine is of things, and/or signs. But even things are learned through signs. But here (those) are properly named things, which are not employed to signify anything; but signs, those whose use is in signifying." But of these there are some, whose every use is in signifying, not in justifying, that is, which we do not use except for the sake of signifying something, as (are) some Sacraments of the Law [legalia]; others, which not only signify, but confer that which helps inwardly, as the evangelical Sacraments (do). "From which it is openly understood, what are here named signs: those things namely, which are employed to signify something. Therefore every sign is also some thing. For because it is no thing, as Augustine said in the same (book), it is entirely nothing; but conversely not every thing is a sign," because it is not employed to signify anything. And since the studious and modest speculation of theologians is intent upon these, it turns toward the Sacred Page to hold the form prescribed in doctrine.<sup>50</sup>

The central theme of and purpose for the *Four Books of Sentences* was to argue for the sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church. He framed the "signs and symbols" as the central interpretive motif, leveraging Augustine to make his point. Books 1–3 merely formed the platter upon which the dish of the sacraments is displayed in Book 4. As we will see below, at the beginning of Book 4, Lombard repeated these identical concepts and themes.

---

Bredero a fait une description sévère: pour lui 'le jugement qu'il porta en 1144 sur l'hérétique Henri de Lausanne dans une lettre envoyée au comte de Saint-Gilles doit être considéré comme une assertion sans fondement' (Monique Zerner, "Introduction" in *Guillaume Monachi, Contre Henri Schismatique et Hérétique suivi de Contre les hérétiques et schismatiques* [anonyme] [Paris: Cerf, 2011], 42; translation mine; she cites A. H. Bredero, *Bernard de Clairvaux* [1091–1153]: *culte et histoire, de l'impénétrabilité d'une biographie hagiographique* [Turnhout, 1998], 14).

<sup>50</sup>"Peter Lombard's *Sententiarum Liber Primus: De Dei Unitate et Trinitate*; available at: <https://franciscan-archive.org/lombardus/I-Sent.html> (Online); accessed 21 Oct 2018; Internet; (Bk 1, D 1, c 1, n 1).

### Peter Lombard's Logical Progressions

English translator Giulio Silano commented on the benefits of Lombard's discussion of the "conversion of angels" prior to his addressing the "conversion of mankind," "The placement of angelology at the beginning of Book 2 has allowed Peter to raise issues such as the freedom of the will and the role of grace in salvation in a less heated context than that of human creation and salvation."<sup>51</sup> Hence, Lombard set the hook in Book 2, addressing the speculative "conversion of angels," metaphorically mollifying antagonism before discussing the "conversion of mankind" in the same book. In this way Lombard throughout his *Four Books of Sentences* wove his rhetoric, prefiguring arguments with allegory, metaphor, and typology. He refined his rhetoric to address one controversial topic after another, conceiving and artfully inserting a topic early in his discussion. Then, like a well-written symphony, when the time was right, came the resolution to the problem earlier conceived metaphorically. Further, when reading his *Sentences*, it becomes difficult to remember which "Father" of the church, if any, affirmed the position espoused earlier by Lombard. Lombard skillfully worked this technique over and over. The result is a mesmerizing maze of subjects and citations.

In another example, Lombard argued for the power of the sacraments, given to the bride of Christ, the (Catholic) church, as in the citation of Pope Benedict XVI above. In this allegory, while he was sleeping on the cross, Jesus bestowed his bride, the church, its sacraments, symbolized by the blood and water flowing from his side. Here, Lombard snatched a gloss of Augustine on John 19:34, which linked Jesus sleeping on the cross to Eve's being taken from the rib of Adam while he was sleeping (Gen 2:21–22). By analogy, the water and blood were baptism and the cup of the Lord's Supper being poured out upon the bride of Christ, as is explained in 1 John 5:8. Pope Benedict recounted this argument as he honored the memory of Lombard, "Just as, in fact, woman was formed from Adam's rib while he slept, so the Church was born from the sacraments that began to flow from the side of Christ, asleep on the Cross, that is, from the blood and water with which we are redeemed from sin and cleansed of guilt' (*Sentences* 3 [*sic*], 18, 4).<sup>52</sup>

The citation is not actually from Book 3, but actually from Book 2, "On Creation" (Bk 2, D 18, c 3, m2). Master Peter's use of allegorical interpretation in Book 2 preempted arguments to the contrary, preparing his student for the policies and procedures on the sacraments in Book 4. According to a footnote in the French translation of Marc Ozilou, the entire paragraph cited by Lombard (Bk 2, D 18, c 3, n 2) and cited by Pope Benedict XVI came from Anselm of Laon's *Summary of the Sentences* as a citation from Augustin of Hippo.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>51</sup>Giulio Silano, "Introduction," in Lombard, *The Sentences: Book 2*, xiii.

<sup>52</sup>Benedict XVI, General Audience: "Peter Lombard" (Rome, 30 Dec 2009).

<sup>53</sup>"Ce n° 2 est tiré de la *Somme des sentences*, III, 3 (PL 171, col. 1119d ; 176, col. 92cd), et remonte

By masterfully mobilizing the citations of the “Fathers” and uniquely merging positions on controversial topics, Lombard achieved the goal for which Bernard of Clairvaux had elevated him—Lombard affirmed Bernard’s view of the sacraments. Through Lombard’s rhetorical efforts, God had deeded over his entire work of salvation to the human agency of Rome’s living hierarchy by way of the sacraments. These same allegorical and semantic methods were used in many other instances.

### On the Holy Spirit’s Filiation of Jesus

The master of the *Sentences* posited that the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, significantly impacted both human sexuality and Christology. Toward the beginning of Book 3, Lombard took up the topic of the “Incarnation of the Word,” “treating those things which pertain to the mystery of the Word made flesh, so that, with God revealing, we may be able to utter some little things on these ineffable matters.”<sup>54</sup> In the first distinction, Lombard considered why Jesus, rather than the Father or the Holy Spirit, took on flesh. In Distinction 2, Lombard considered how he took on flesh. In Distinction 3, Lombard addressed how Jesus took on flesh in the womb of the Virgin Mary. In the middle of making his point, he added, “And so it [is] usual to ask.” This phrase is found often in Lombard’s writings, used when he initiated an important logical leap. “And so it [is] usual to ask why Levi, but not Christ, paid tithes in Abraham, since each of them was in Abraham’s loins according to material reason when Abraham was tithed, that is, gave tithes to Melchisedech.”<sup>55</sup> Before entering the line of reasoning in Book 3, we have to look back to two concepts in Book 2. First, in his description of sin in Book 2, Lombard addressed sex (or concupiscence), speaking of it generally, and then in marriage, “Now, what deserves punishment is sin; and so anyone born through concupiscence of the flesh contracts sin.”<sup>56</sup> Also, “Augustine clearly shows this, in the book *On Faith to Peter*; ‘When a husband and wife come together in this manner, the intercourse of parents is not without lust and, because of this, the conception of their children born from the flesh cannot be without sin.’”<sup>57</sup> Thus, even human sexuality in marriage was sinful for Lombard.

Second, after answering “Why they did not have sexual intercourse in Paradise,”<sup>58</sup> Lombard addressed concupiscence (or sex in marriage) as an “inferior state” and celibacy as a “better state,”

---

finalement à Augustin, *Sur Jean*, tr. 120, n° 2 (PL 35, col. 1953 ; CCL 36, p. 661 ; BA 75, p. 335 s.)” (Lombard [Fr], Bk 2, p 224, note 2).

<sup>54</sup>Peter Lombard, *The Sentences: Book 3, On the Incarnation of the Word*, 3.

<sup>55</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 3, c 3, n 1), 11.

<sup>56</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 2, D 30, c 7, n 3), 148.

<sup>57</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 2, D 32, c 7, n 2), 157.

<sup>58</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 2, D 20, c 2), 87.

On the end of that inferior life, whether they would have been transferred in succession after the begetting of children, or all at once . . . or would fathers remain in some state of life, making use of the tree of life, until their children reached the same state and, when the number was complete, all would have been transferred together to better things, in order to be *as the angels of God in heaven* [Matt 22:30].<sup>59</sup>

Or “the parents were able to give way to their children, so that their number should be filled by successions. After the begetting of children and the fulfillment of the just requirements of their human duty, they would have been transferred to a better state, not by death, by some change” [Augustine].<sup>60</sup>

With those foundations on (1) the sinful nature of concupiscence in marriage as well as (2) the lower state of marriage and the higher state of celibacy from Book 2, Lombard went on in Book 3 and asked the question about Jesus paying tithes through the loins of Abraham. From this allegorical fulcrum, Lombard discussed the role of the Holy Spirit in the incarnation of Christ. First, sex in marriage is sinful and base, being by the movement of concupiscence,

“But this does not follow in the case of Christ, even though he was in the loins of Adam and Abraham, because he did not descend from them by concupiscence of the flesh” [Ordinary gloss, on Heb 7:10]. “And so, although Levi and Christ were in Abraham’s loins according to the flesh when he was tithed, they were not equally tithed on that account, because Christ was there in a manner by which Levi was not” [Augustine].<sup>61</sup>

Second, the Holy Spirit could not have conceived in Mary as takes place in concupiscence.<sup>62</sup> Therefore, only the divine nature of the Holy Spirit “adopted” (my word) that which was supernaturally formed in Mary without a surrogate seed from the Holy Spirit,

Jerome in the *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*. And so he is said to have been conceived and born of the Holy Spirit not because the Holy Spirit stood “in the place of the seed” [Pelagius] to the Virgin: for what was born did not take seed from the substance of the Holy Spirit; but because, by the grace of God and the operation of the Holy Spirit, what was united to the Word was taken from the flesh of the Virgin.<sup>63</sup>

Third, Jesus was merely the “Wisdom of God” clothed in the flesh of Mary, “‘And so the Wisdom of God, which is called the only-begotten Son, declared the liberation of humankind by taking human form’ [Augustine] in the womb and from the womb of the Virgin.”<sup>64</sup>

<sup>59</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 2, D 20, c 3, n 1), 88.

<sup>60</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 2, D 20, c 3, n 2), 88.

<sup>61</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 3, c 3, n 2), 12.

<sup>62</sup>“‘And so, although his flesh is the same as ours, yet it was not made in the womb in the same way as ours. For it was sanctified in the womb and was born without sin, and also he did not ever sin in it. And so it is similar to our flesh as to punishment, but not as to the quality of sin’ [Ambrosiaster], because (Origen:) ‘it did not have the same pollution as flesh which is conceived from the movements of concupiscence,’ nor was it born from carnal pleasure’ (Lombard [Eng] [Bk 3, D 3, c 4, n 1], 13).

<sup>63</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 4, c 2, n 4), 16.

<sup>64</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 12, c 4), 49.

Thus, the question of why Levi and not Christ paid tithes to Melchisedech through Abraham was leveraged to weave a masterful doctrinal web. It efficiently set up the sacrament of holy orders as higher and better than the sacrament of holy matrimony, as noted above.<sup>65</sup>

The preceding arguments exemplify Lombard's logical cleverness. This author was truly captivated when reading of Book 2; it has a mesmerizing appeal. Books 2 and 3, with their arranged arguments, provide analogies to buttress the duality of the sacraments, that is, earthly matter being infused with supernatural grace. Just as the sacraments are conferred with a dual nature, so also was the God-man, Jesus.

### **The Holy Spirit as the Love of God**

The debate over what happened in the womb of Mary at the conception of Jesus gained intensity and clarity for Lombard. Through this discussion, Lombard appeared to prefigure his argument for the Spirit and matter in the sacrament of the altar—foreshadowing a priest calling down the true body of Christ in the eucharist, in transubstantiated form, simply by breathing the proper words. These righteous ends justified the use of the doctrine of the incarnation as the means. If the arguments related to the incarnation of Jesus Christ appear convoluted, it is because they are. By the artful weaving of arguments, Lombard weaponized Christology to affirm his sacerdotal soteriology and provide fodder for attacking non-sacramental thought as heresy. However, before addressing the sacraments, we must work our way through the Holy Spirit's operations in the accidents of the embryo in the womb of Mary.

Lombard began his discussion of the Holy Spirit using terminology more akin to Arianism than to orthodoxy. The number one concept that Lombard used to describe the Holy Spirit was “the love between the Father and the Son.” Hence, Lombard focused on an attribute rather than on the language of personhood. Here are several examples:

Concerning the Holy Spirit, and it is said first that he is the love of the Father and the Son. After our discussion of the Son's eternity, “Let us now treat of the Holy Spirit, insofar as our gracious God allows us to see into this subject” [Augustine].<sup>66</sup>

“For it can be taught by many examples that many names of things are used both universally and specifically by application of particular things” [Augustine]. . . . “And just as we specifically call the one Word of God by the name of wisdom, even though universally the Holy Spirit and the Father is that same wisdom, so the Holy Spirit is properly called by the name of love, even though universally love is also the Father and the Son” [Augustine].<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup>Likewise, as to “higher and lower” consider the following statement of Lombard: “in the same way now in us, the sensual motion of the soul is like the serpent, the lower portion of reason is like the woman, and the higher one like the man” (Lombard [Eng] [Bk 2, D 24, c 7], 111).

<sup>66</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 10, c 1, n 1), 58.

<sup>67</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 10, c 2, n 1), 59.

He returns to show what he had proposed, namely that the Holy Spirit is the love by which the Father is loved by the Son, and the Son by the Father. But now let us attend to what we had started to show, namely that the Holy Spirit is the affection or love of the Father and Son, namely the love by which the Father loves the Son and the Son loves the Father.— Concerning this, Jerome on Psalm 14 says: “The Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son, but the love which the Father has toward the Son and the Son toward the Father” [Jerome].<sup>68</sup>

The unprepared, adolescent student entering Lombard’s class at Notre Dame in Paris would have no idea why he repeated over and over the concept of the Holy Spirit being love. Was not his young mind being prepared by the sagacious Peter to accept the idea that this same love incarnated Mary without anything in the likeness of human seed? So also, he would be taught that this same impersonal love infuses divine power in the host in the eucharist, recreating and reenacting the true filiation (conception) of Christ on the altar.

Jumping from Book 1, Distinction 10 to Distinction 17, Lombard then defined the Holy Spirit in salvation by using “God is love” (cf. 1 John 4:4, 8, 16). When a person “loves the very love by which he loves his neighbour,” then he loves the Holy Spirit, the manifestation of God’s love,

In order that this may be taught more intelligibly and perceived more fully, a certain premise must be made which is very necessary to this end. And it has been said above, and it has been shown by sacred authorities, that the Holy Spirit is the love of the Father and the Son by which they love each other and us. It must be added to this that the very same Holy Spirit is the love or charity by which we love God and neighbour. When this charity is in us, so that it makes us love God and neighbour, then the Holy Spirit is said to be sent or given to us; and whoever loves the very love by which he loves his neighbour, in that very thing loves God, because that very love is God, that is, the Holy Spirit.<sup>69</sup>

“Embrace God who is love, and embrace God in love. Love is the very thing which conjoins all the good angels and all God’s servants in the bond of holiness. For the more holy we are and the more emptied of the swelling of pride, the more we are filled with love; and with what is filled who is full of love, if not God?” By these words, Augustine sufficiently shows that the very love by which we love God and neighbor is God.<sup>70</sup>

If among God’s gifts there is no greater than love, and if no gift of God is greater than the Holy Spirit, what follows more compellingly than that he himself is the love which is called both God and of God?<sup>71</sup>

In Book 1, Distinction 31–32, Lombard reemphasized the theme that the Holy Spirit is the love by which the Father and the Son love each other,

<sup>68</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 10, c 2, n 4), 60.

<sup>69</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 17, c 1, n 2), 88.

<sup>70</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 17, c 1, n 3), 89; citing Augustine, *De Trinitate*, bk 8 cc 7–8 nn 11–12.

<sup>71</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 17, c 2), 89–90; citing Augustine, *De Trinitate*, bk 15, c 19, n 37.

Hence Augustine, in *On the Trinity*, book 15: “The Spirit of both is in a certain consubstantial communion of Father and Son.” The same, in book 7, “The Holy Spirit is the highest charity, joining both together, and also us from below.”<sup>72</sup>

Whether the Father or the Son love by means of the Holy Spirit, since for God to love is the same as to be. Here arises a question which follows from what is said above. For it has been said above, and it has been shown by the authorities of the Saints, that the Holy Spirit is the communion of Father and Son, and the love by which Father and Son love each other. And so it is asked whether the Father or the Son loves through the Holy Spirit or by means of the Holy Spirit.—It seems entirely fitting to assert this according to the authorities set out above, by which it is shown that it is the Holy Spirit “by whom the begotten is loved by the begetter and, in turn, loves his begetter” [Augustine].<sup>73</sup>

In Distinction 34, Lombard also attributes goodness to the Holy Spirit, further developing themes that would eventually culminate in the concept of the “Undivided Trinity,” including why goodness is attributed to the Holy Spirit,

It is not that the Father is alone powerful or more powerful, and the Son alone wise or wiser, and the Holy Spirit alone good or of greater goodness. For the power, wisdom, benignity of the three is one, just as their essence [*sic*] is one; and so, just as the Son is called “homoousios,” that is, consubstantial with the Father, so too he is called co-omnipotent.<sup>74</sup>

The confused student of Lombard finds no personality in the Holy Spirit. The master of the *Sentences* projected the Holy Spirit as an impersonal force, primarily consisting of the love that the Father and the Son have for each other. Absent is the Holy Spirit’s inspiration of Scripture, his supernatural watch-care over the Scriptures, and his assistance in the interpretation of the Bible. Absent is the Holy Spirit convicting of sin, righteousness, and judgment. Absent is his enlightenment of the mind to behold the glory of Christ. Absent is every believer being filled with the Holy Spirit; absent are the gifts of the Spirit for every believer; and absent is the command not to grieve the Spirit, by whom and through whom we are sealed unto the day of redemption. Rather, to the unlearned mind, Lombard appears to teach an Arian Holy Spirit. He corresponds to a force, a power, or an attribute of God, that is, the love of God.

### **The Holy Spirit in the Conception of Jesus**

Lombard’s skillful redacting of sources appears to reach its apex when he addressed the incarnation of the Word, or more precisely, the conception of Jesus in the womb of Mary. To introduce the important concept of the “Undivided Trinity,” Lombard prodded his students with this question: “Why the Son took on flesh, and not the Father and the Holy Spirit.” One response might be, did not the Father take on flesh in Christ? After all, his

---

<sup>72</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 31, c 6), 173.

<sup>73</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 32, c 1, n 1), 173.

<sup>74</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 34, c 4, n 2), 192.

name is called “Almighty God” in Isaiah 9:6. As one can expect, Lombard was armed with arguments for all the common Scriptures used in this debate. Lombard’s primary purpose was to separate the “Son of God” from “Son of Man” in the minds of his students before discussing the incarnation. By the end of this discussion, Lombard would discuss the twofold birth of Christ, one as “Son of God” and one as “Son of Man.”<sup>75</sup> Then based on the fact that Christ had two births, it opened up the possibility of adoring Christ’s humanity (e.g., adoration of the host):

1. On the adoration of Christ’s humanity: whether the same adoration is to be extended to humanity and to his divinity. . . . But *latria* is understood as the service or worship due to the Creator alone; if it is extended to the soul or flesh of Christ, since the soul of Christ or his flesh is only a creature, that which is due the Creator alone is extended to the creature. The charge of idolatry is made against one who does such a thing.
2. Some say it is not to be adored by the same adoration. And so it seems to some that the flesh or soul of Christ is not to be adored by the adoration which is *latria*, but by the one which is *dulia*.<sup>76</sup>

The perceptive reader may note that Lombard, by virtue of Jesus having two births, represented two persons, the Son of God and the Son of Man. By use of the two births, Lombard staged:

- the worship of the host in the eucharistic mystery;
- the worship (*dulia*) of the physical specimens in the other sacraments; and
- the worship (*dulia*) of relics, statues, and other consecrated items.

When addressing directly the filiation of the Word in Mary, Lombard once again returned to the “Undivided Trinity.” To explain why the Word is said to be “born of the Holy Spirit [alone]” in multiple places in the Scriptures, he reiterated the doctrine of the economic Trinity. Citing that while Christ was born of the Holy Spirit, he is not said to be the Son of the Holy Spirit [Augustine].<sup>77</sup> For no aspect of “humanity comes from the Holy Spirit”—in fact, the entire humanity of Jesus (i.e., all 46 chromosomes) came from Mary,

Undoubtedly, he was not born from him as from a father, but he was from her as a mother.<sup>78</sup>

Jerome in the *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*. And so he is said to have been conceived and born of the Holy Spirit not because the Holy Spirit stood “in the place of the seed” [Pelagius] to the Virgin: for what was born did not take seed from the substance of the Holy Spirit; but because, by the grace of God and the operation of the Holy Spirit, what was united to the Word was taken from the flesh of the Virgin.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>75</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 8, c 2), 38.

<sup>76</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 9, c 1, nn 1–2), 39.

<sup>77</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 4, c 2, n 2), 16.

<sup>78</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 4, c 2, n 1), 15.

<sup>79</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 4, c 2, n 4), 16.

1. Why the Apostle says that Christ was made, but we profess that he was born.—Ambrose. “The Apostle says *made* [Gal 4:4], and not born, because the Lord’s flesh was formed and given bodily shape in the Virgin’s womb not by human seed, but by the working and power of the Holy Spirit. For it is one thing to beget by mixture of seed and the coagulation of blood; it is another to procreate not by commixture, but by power.” Men can beget human children, but they cannot make them.—That is why the Apostle said *made*, not *born*, namely so that his birth, which occurred without the seed of man, should not be held to be like ours,<sup>80</sup> which is done by commixture of seeds.<sup>81</sup>

2. Why from the seed of David, Augustine, in the book *On the Trinity*. And so, when the Apostle said *made*, he added *from the seed of David*, because, “although no seed of man intervened in the Virgin’s conception, yet, because Christ was formed from that flesh which had descended from seed, it is rightly said that he was made [from the seed]” [Syagrius].<sup>82</sup>

Hence, Lombard taught that all of the human nature of Jesus came from the womb of Mary, and none of it came from the Holy Spirit as “the seed of man.”

To add to this confusion, in which Augustine was quoted as saying, “let the mind be cleansed by faith,”<sup>83</sup> Lombard appeared to argue for two Christs, “Son of God” and “Son of Man.” In so doing, he contradicted his prior statements in Book 3, Distinction 1, “Therefore we do not affirm two Christs, nor two sons, but the one Son who is God and man.”<sup>84</sup> In doing so, Lombard prepared himself for plausible deniability. Lombard knew what was coming in Distinctions 6 and 8. More directly, Lombard was setting up how the divine nature can be said to be born of the Virgin Mary.

In Distinction 6, Chapter 4, Lombard argued for the different “habitus”<sup>85</sup> among persons, which he then applied to the Trinity. He included at the end of Chapter 6 this statement about the Son of God, “We profess him . . . from conception of the Holy Spirit according to the habit of man [Hilary].”<sup>86</sup> In Distinction 7, Lombard began a rhetorical progression toward a duality in Christ,

<sup>80</sup>This author asks, how then was he made in every way just as we are, yet without sin? (Heb 2:17).

<sup>81</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 4, c 3, n 1), 17.

<sup>82</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 4, c 3, n 2), 17. Hence, the promise of the seed in Gen 3:15 (“And I will put enmity . . . between your seed and her Seed”) was merely allegorical or typological.

<sup>83</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 6, c 6, n 4), 30.

<sup>84</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 1, c 1, n 4), 5.

<sup>85</sup>“Or, l’application polysémique du terme n’en permet pas une traduction unique. En fonction du contexte, nous traduirons donc ‘habitus’ par ‘manière de se comporter,’ ‘aptitude’ ou ‘habit’” (“Therefore, the polysemic application of this term does not permit a unique translation. By function of context, we will therefore translate ‘habitus’ by ‘manner of behavior,’ ‘aptitude,’ or ‘clothing’” [Lombard [Fr], Bk. 3, p 222, note 2]; translation mine).

<sup>86</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 6, c 6, n 7), 31.

The same [Augustine], *To Filicianus*: “The Son of God is one thing, the son of man another thing, but not another being.”—Also: “The Son of God is one thing from the Father, another from the Mother.”—The same, in *On the Trinity*, book 1: “Although the Son is both God and man, one substance is God and another substance is man.”<sup>87</sup>

17. Cassiodorus. And so, in saying “God is man,” either the habit is predicated, or the person, but humanized. And Cassiodorus appears to show that a humanized person is what is being predicated, saying, “He was made, so to speak, a humanized God, who does not cease to be God, even in the taking of flesh.” Yet this may be taken in different ways: as to say “God was made one who is humanized,” or “Christ is made a God who is humanized”; for either of these may certainly be said. And so, when “God was made man” is said, according to them, it has a manifold meaning: that he is understood to have taken human nature, or to have begun to be the Word humanized. Yet it does not follow that, if he began to be the Word humanized, that he would have begun to be the Word. Nor, if God is made the Word humanized, does it follow that he was made the Word.<sup>88</sup>

Hence Augustine, in *On the Trinity*, Book 1: “God the Son is equal in nature with God the Father, but less in habit. For in *the form of a servant*, he is less the Father; but in *the form of God*, he is equal to the Father.”<sup>89</sup>

1. Whether the divine nature ought to be said to be born of the Virgin. . . . And yet it appears that it can be proved that it was born of the Virgin, for if for God to be born of the Virgin is this: namely to take on human form in the Virgin’s womb, since the divine nature has been said above to have taken human form, it appears that it must be said to have been born.<sup>90</sup>

It appears to be indicated by this authority that the divine nature is born and conceived of the Virgin; but if the words are diligently noted, it is seen to treat rather of the person: which without doubt must be said to be born of the Father and the Mother.<sup>91</sup>

On the twofold birth of Christ, who was born twice. It is also usual to ask whether Christ ought to be said to have been begotten twice, since he is called son of God and of man. . . . John of Damascus. . . . “For us, because of our salvation; like us, because he was a man born from a woman and in the [usual] time from conception,” namely nine months; “above us, because it was not by seed, but by the Holy Spirit and the holy Virgin, transcending the law of conception.” From these words, it is clearly apparent that there were two nativities of Christ, and that he was born twice.<sup>92</sup>

Ambrose. . . . “The man, when about to die, cries out at the separation from the Godhead; for since the Godhead is free from death, most certainly death could not be there, unless life had first departed, for the Godhead is life.” Here he appears to assert that, at death, the Godhead was separated from the man, and that unless it had departed, that man could not have died. They refer this to the flesh, which they say has been separated from God. . . . From this, it is sufficiently shown that the above words of Ambrose are to be taken as we said earlier.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>87</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 7, c 1, n 8), 33.

<sup>88</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 7, c 1, n 17), 36.

<sup>89</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 7, c 2, n 3), 36.

<sup>90</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 8, c 1, n 1), 37–38.

<sup>91</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 8, c 1, n 2), 38.

<sup>92</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 8, c 2), 38.

<sup>93</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 21, c 1, n 3–4), 88–89.

He concluded that Christ had a dual birth and Christ had a dual parentage, Son of God by the Father from all eternity and Son of God from Mary in time and history. Lombard wove together differing strands into a complex pattern based on the long history of debates with Christianity. His view of the Trinity slowly unfolds its purpose in many other areas of doctrine and practice championed by his patron, Bernard of Clairvaux. The biblical doctrine of the Holy Spirit seems to stand at cross-purposes with Clairvaux's purposes in cleansing Evangelical heresy from lands held by the church.

### **The Holy Spirit and the Undivided Trinity**

Lombard appears to be intentionally diminishing the person and role of the Holy Spirit. He particularly deemphasizes the work of the Holy Spirit in contexts where his role is championed in Scripture. In those contexts, Lombard argued for a work by the "Undivided Trinity." The vehemence and regularity with which he returns to the work of the "Undivided Trinity" begs the question: to what end would Lombard reduce the role of the Holy Spirit? Further, since "nature abhors a vacuum," if the work of the Holy Spirit is deflated, then what is inflated in its place?

We begin by noting examples where Lombard champions the work of the "Undivided Trinity":

For, indeed, the nature of the Father and the Son and the Spirit is one. It follows that, if the Son is generated from the Father's nature, he is generated from the nature of the Son and the Holy Spirit, indeed from the nature of the three persons.<sup>94</sup>

"He is also the same who was sent from heaven on the day of Pentecost. How then is he not God, who sends the Holy Spirit? On the contrary, how great a God is he who gives God?" [Augustine] See, he plainly says here that the Holy Spirit himself, namely God, is given to men by Father and Son.<sup>95</sup>

Note that he says here that the Son gave himself because the Trinity gave him. If the Son was given by himself and proceeded from himself, and this is entirely true, and must be granted, because his sending is a divine operation.<sup>96</sup>

Consider also the entire Distinction 19 in Book 1.<sup>97</sup>

Have no fear: for there is no division of parts in the unity of the Trinity. "The Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit is one God: that is, this same Trinity is one God" [Augustine]. . . Therefore each one of these three cannot be a part of the Trinity.<sup>98</sup>

Augustine to Maximinus: "For it is not the Father alone, or the Son alone, or the Holy Spirit alone, who is God, but the Trinity itself is the one and only God."<sup>99</sup>

<sup>94</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 5, c 1, n 12), 34.

<sup>95</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 14, c 2, n 1), 74.

<sup>96</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 15, c 4, n 1), 80.

<sup>97</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 19), 104-16.

<sup>98</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 19, c 5-6, n 2), 109.

<sup>99</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 21, c 2, n 5), 121.

Diversity brings about the separation of the divinity, singleness does away with the distinction of trinity. . . . And so from the foregoing it is established that there is no diversity in the Trinity.<sup>100</sup>

That God is not to be called manifold. And as in the Trinity there is no diversity, so there is no multiplicity; and so God is not to be called manifold, but threefold and simple. Hence Ambrose, in *On the Trinity*, book 1, says: “In the Father and the Son, there is no discord, but one divinity; what is one cannot be confused, and what is undifferentiated cannot be manifold.” And so God is not manifold.<sup>101</sup>

For the religious [assertion of the] unity of the name, grounded in the essence of an identical nature, did not take away the person constituted of the born essence so that one and singular substance of God is understood by the unity of the name, since the one name of each essence, that is the one God, is predicated because of the identical substance of the undifferentiated nature in each.<sup>102</sup>

Moreover those things said of God according to the substance are equally suitable for all three persons. . . . From this it becomes clear that the Trinity is the highest perfection.<sup>103</sup>

There, if only partially—for *in part we know and in part we prophesy*—, it is explained how the Holy Spirit dwells in us, who does not indwell without the Father and the Son.<sup>104</sup>

The whole Trinity, whose will and operation is one, made the servile form which was taken by the Son alone.<sup>105</sup>

And so the frequent mention of the Holy Spirit does not exclude the Father or the Son from that work; it is rather the case that, by naming the one, the three are understood, as often happens with reference to other works.<sup>106</sup>

Augustine: the stating of the question. Hence Augustine, raising a question with regard to this, determines it in the following way in the *Enchiridion*, saying: “That creature which the Virgin conceived and bore, although it pertained to the person of the Son alone, was nevertheless the work of the whole Trinity. Since this is so, and the works of the Trinity are not severable, why is the Holy Spirit alone named in making them?”—Solution. “Or is it that, when one of the three is named with reference to any work, the Trinity is understood to work everything? This is truly the case, and it can be taught by examples.” You have heard the question being stated and its exposition.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>100</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 23, c 5, n 5), 130.

<sup>101</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 23, c 6), 130.

<sup>102</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 31, c 4, n 3), 172.

<sup>103</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 34, c 3), 191.

<sup>104</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 37, c 2, n 3), 204.

<sup>105</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 2, c 3, n 2), 9.

<sup>106</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 4, c 1, n 1), 14. The heading for this distinction and chapter reads, “Why in Scripture the Incarnation, which is the work of the Trinity, is more often attributed to the Holy Spirit, and [Christ] is even said to have been conceived and born of the Holy Spirit.”

<sup>107</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 4, c 1, n 2), 14–15.

And although the entire Trinity worked the making of the man who was taken, because the works of the Trinity are not severable, yet the Son alone took on human form in the singularity of his person, not in the unity of divine nature, that is, that which is proper to the Son alone, not that which is common to the Trinity [Council of Toledo VIII].<sup>108</sup>

The doctrine of the “Undivided Trinity” was upheld by Lombard when he spoke of the work of the Holy Spirit. But when the master of the *Sentences* addressed the person or work of the Son, then he did not uphold this staunch unity of the “Undivided Trinity.” This uneven application of his cognition may foreshadow his teaching on the work of the Trinity in the sacraments, by which the Holy Spirit is believed to act in Christological dualism within and by means of the species [mass or matter] of the sacrament, without ever affecting its *accidens* [outward appearance].<sup>109</sup> The “Undivided Trinity” operates by God’s word and love alone.

Nevertheless, so far in the first three *Books of Sentences*, there was not a word about the gifts of the Spirit given to every believer. Being “born again” was relegated to numerous discussion points of what was meant by “water and blood” in John 3:5 (and 1 John 5:8). Lombard never discussed the Holy Spirit inspiring the words of Scripture. In fact, if anything he rebuffed the inspiration of Scripture using the analogy of Gen 2:7,

For God formed the body from the mud of the earth and *breathed* the soul in it, or, according to another version, *blew* or *blew forth* the soul. It is not that he blew with his cheeks or formed the body with corporeal hands: for God is spirit and not composed of the features of limbs.<sup>110</sup>

4. The opinion of some heretics who held that the soul is from the substance of God. Adhering stubbornly to the words of Scripture, where it says: *he breathed*, or *he blew forth*, etc., they say that, when a man breathes or blows forth, he sends out his breath from himself; so also, when God is said to have blown forth or breathed his breath in the face of man, he is understood to have sent out the spirit of man from himself, that is, from his own substance.<sup>111</sup>

5. Response of Augustine. Those who say this do not understand that *breathe* or *blew*, was said metaphorically, that is, God made the breath of man, namely the soul. . . . And so the breath by which he animated man was made by God, not from God; nor from any matter, but from nothing.<sup>112</sup>

Hence, by analogy, the master of the *Sentences* removed the idea of God exhaling Scripture, as stated in 2 Tim 3:16 (ESV), “All Scripture is exhaled by God.” He simultaneously blunted and hollowed out the teachings about God exhaling his Spirit into man can be applied to

<sup>108</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 5, c 1, c 4), 18–19.

<sup>109</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 8, c 6), 44.

<sup>110</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 2, D 17, c 1, n 2), 71.

<sup>111</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 2, D 17, c 1, n 4), 72.

<sup>112</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 2, D 17, c 1, n 5), 72. Citation of Bede, *Libri quatuor in principium Genesis* 2:7.

(1) God breathing out Scripture (2 Tim 3:16); (2) Christ breathing out his Spirit onto his disciples (John 20:22); and (3) the Holy Spirit empowering God's word to bring spiritual rebirth (Rom 10:17; John 3:8). All of these breathings of Scripture are unique to the role of the Holy Spirit after the resurrection of Christ. With Lombard's view of an "Undivided Trinity," the Holy Spirit is depersonalized, and his unique ministry is all but eliminated.

### The Holy Spirit in the Sacraments

Whereas the first three *Books of Sentences* are primarily theoretical, Book 4 is packed with policies and procedures for the proper ordering of the sacraments. In Book 4, all the elements of salvation that are thought to be in the domain of the Holy Spirit were transferred to the church as the only valid catalyzer of the sacraments. This emphasis on the church is so strong that Warfield wrote that in Catholicism, the church replaced the role of the Holy Spirit as the dispenser of the grace of salvation,

The Church has completely taken the place of the Spirit of God as the proximate source of grace, and the action of the divine Spirit in applying salvation is postponed to and made subject to the operations of the Church through its ordinances. Thus the soul is removed from immediate dependence upon God and taught rather to come to the Church and to expect all endowments of grace directly from it.<sup>113</sup>

Warfield's deductions, based on the writings he consulted, were in accord with Lombard's *Sentences* in Book 4. As noted above, in Book 4 Lombard returned to the theme that he introduced as he opened Book One, the Doctrine of Signs and Symbols,

On the Doctrine of Signs.

After our treatment of what pertains to the doctrine of things which are to be enjoyed and of those which are to be used, and of those which enjoy and use [apparently Books 1–3], let us now proceed to the doctrine of signs.<sup>114</sup>

Book 4 then addressed the sacraments in great detail. It is by far the most voluminous book of the four. It began by defining "sacrament." Citing Augustine of Hippo, Lombard explained,

What is a sacrament.—Augustine, in Book 10, *The City of God*: "A sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing." And yet a sacrament is also called a "sacred secret," the sacrament of the Godhead, for example, so that the sacrament is a sacred thing which designates the sacred thing which is designated. But what is now at issue is the sacrament according to its being a sign. Also, a sacrament is a visible form of an invisible grace.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>113</sup>Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation*, 79.

<sup>114</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, Preamble), 3.

<sup>115</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 1, c 2, n 1), 3.

What is properly called a sacrament. For a sacrament is properly so called because it is a sign of God's grace and a form of invisible grace in such manner that it bears its image and is its cause. And so the sacraments were not instituted only for the sake of signifying, but also to sanctify.<sup>116</sup>

In what a sacrament consists. A sacrament consists of two elements, namely words and things: words, such as the invocation of the Trinity, and things, such as water, oil, and suchlike.<sup>117</sup>

Therefore, Lombard viewed the sacraments as the instruments of the grace of God.

Two issues came up, for Lombard, regarding the Holy Spirit in baptism. He discussed the baptism of Jesus as opposed to the baptism of John the Baptist. He also discussed whether all three names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit had to be named for baptism to be considered valid. On the one hand, Pope Zacharias wrote to Bishop Boniface,

On the form of baptism. . . . "It was most firmly commanded in the Synod of the English that whoever was immersed without the invocation of the Trinity would not have the sacrament of regeneration. Which is entirely true, because if someone is immersed in the baptismal font without the invocation of the Trinity, he is not a perfect Christian, unless he has been baptized in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit."<sup>118</sup>

On the other hand, Ambrose wrote of baptism in one name only,

Whether baptism may be given in the name of the Father or the Spirit alone. . . . Ambrose seems to say that, if the mystery of the Trinity is held in faith, and only one person is named, then the sacrament would be complete; conversely, if the three persons are named, but something is not rightly held about any of them, then the mystery is empty. . . . "When Christ's name is said, the mystery is fulfilled through the unity of the name, nor is the Spirit separated from the baptism of Christ, because Christ was not baptized in the Spirit."

...

True baptism can be conferred in Christ's name. It also appears that true baptism can be conferred in the name of the Father alone, or in the Holy Spirit alone, so long as the one who baptizes has the faith of the Trinity, which Trinity is understood in each of these names.<sup>119</sup>

On the baptism of children, Lombard cited Augustine, *On Penance*, "Children alone are not bound by this penance, when they are baptized."<sup>120</sup> Meanwhile, adults are dutybound to "faith and repentance" (not this reversed order), without which the regenerative power of the sacrament of baptism is nullified,

<sup>116</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 1, c 4, n 2), 4.

<sup>117</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 1, c 5, n 6), 6.

<sup>118</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 3, c 2), 12.

<sup>119</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 3, c 4, n 1, 3), 13.

<sup>120</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 4, c 2, n 2), 19.

By these and other testimonies, it is plainly shown that the grace of remission is not conferred upon adults at baptism in absence of faith and repentance, because remission is not given to children without someone else's faith, since they are unable to have their own. And so, if one approaches under false pretences, not having true contrition in his heart, he receives the sacrament without the thing.<sup>121</sup>

Hence, the bottom line is stated, "This is the power to remit sins in baptism. . . . If anyone should be able to explain this better, I bear him no grudge."<sup>122</sup>

Therefore, the Spirit's work in baptism is by lending his name to the rite and the faith of the Trinity. Other than that, we do not even read of the Holy Spirit infusing the divine words of the command in Matt 28:19. Nor do we read of the Holy Spirit alone sanctifying the water of baptism. Quite the opposite, Lombard argues for the equal power of the sacrament whether it comes from a wicked person or a righteous person,

Isidore: "The Roman pontiff does not hold that it is a man who baptizes, but that the Spirit of God administers the grace of baptism, even if the one who baptizes is a pagan."<sup>123</sup>

Augustine qualified this teaching about a person who has received the sacrament of baptism outside the Catholic church,

But he will not have salvation, which is the power of the sacrament. If he has received the same sacrament outside the Catholic church. And so he must return to the Church . . . in order to receive life within the Church. For baptism cannot be of help outside the Church.<sup>124</sup>

In this same way, clarification and equivocation attended each of the seven sacraments described by Lombard.

Of greatest import, however, as far as the Holy Spirit in Lombard relates to the "reception of the Holy Spirit." The issue is summed up by this question: How then is the Holy Spirit received? The answer to this question opens a wide chasm between Evangelical soteriology (based on the Five Solas) and the soteriology of Roman Catholicism. As noted above, Lombard and his benefactor Bernard of Clairvaux were clearly on the sacerdotal side of the debate on soteriology. As far as who represented the Evangelical side in Lombard's context and writings, this is a historiographic question beyond the bounds of this paper.<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 4, c 2, n 3), 19.

<sup>122</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 5, c 3, n 1, 4), 31.

<sup>123</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 5, c 1, n 5), 29. "Rather Fulgentius, *De fide ad Petrum*, c. 3 n43."

<sup>124</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 5, c 1, n 4), 29.

<sup>125</sup>My best answer to this question would be Henry the Monk. However, because none of his writings are extant, and because the only descriptions of his beliefs come off the pens of his ardent antagonists, there is a level of conjecture in answering this question. Even so, it appears from those writings against him that he did not approve of the sacramental system of the Catholic church. In this

How did Lombard address the reception of the Holy Spirit? First, he depersonalized the Holy Spirit by calling him the love of God the Father and God the Son for each other. Second, he neutered any unique ministry of the Holy Spirit by transferring all of his work to the “Undivided Trinity.” Third, Lombard placed the soteriological work of this “Undivided Trinity” in, with, by, and through the sacraments of the church. Fourth, he ignored the possibility of the Holy Spirit working in, with, and by the word of God directly upon the soul of unregenerate man, by framing that view as Pelagianism.<sup>126</sup> We are left with God working through the sacraments, as evidenced by the charity that he has placed in a person’s heart.

Lombard focused on love symbiotically associating it with salvation. For example, Lombard affirmed that love is placed in man’s heart, thereby confirming the presence of the Holy Spirit,

When this charity is in us, so that it makes us love God and neighbour, then the Holy Spirit is said to be sent or given to us; and whoever loves the very love by which he loves his neighbour, in that very thing loves God, because that very love is God, that is, the Holy Spirit.<sup>127</sup>

The complication arises in Book 3, Distinction 29, Chapter 3, whether all men are to be loved equally. Citing Ambrose who was commenting on Song of Solomon 2:4, “He set charity in order within me,” Lombard wrote,

The charity of many is disordered: what is to be in the first place, they place in the third or fourth. God is to be loved first, parents second, then children, then the members of the household; if these last are good, then they are to be placed ahead of the wicked children.<sup>128</sup>

Hence, here, Lombard (or Ambrose) did not include the place of one’s spouse in the order of charity, which is quite an omission. It seems that Lombard was setting up an argument for “uprooting” heretics as enemies of the gospel, even if they are relatives,

And so parents, insofar as they are evil, are to be hated; and enemies are to be loved, insofar as they are human beings. “And so let us love our enemies who gain God’s kingdom, and let us hate our relatives, if they keep us from God’s kingdom.”<sup>129</sup>

Further, Lombard addressed that love (and hence by logical transference salvation) can be lost,

“Frequently, there are some who are at first evil, who afterwards will become good; and at times some who are at first good, who afterwards will become and remain evil” [Ambrose]

---

way he resembled today’s Evangelical.

<sup>126</sup>See Lombard [Eng], Bk 2, D 28, c 1, nn 1–2.

<sup>127</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 1, D 17, c 1, n 2), 88.

<sup>128</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 29, c 2, n 5), 123.

<sup>129</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 29, c 2, n 12), 125.

according to which they are said to be written in the book of life, and then to be expunged from it.<sup>130</sup>

And so, although perfect charity is so rooted that it cannot be lost, yet beginning or progressing charity can be, and often is, lost.<sup>131</sup>

Augustine shows this, saying: “Because *cupidity* [lust; avarice, greed] *is the root of all evils* [1 Tim 6:10], and charity is the root of all goods, both cannot exist at the same time: unless the one is entirely uprooted, the other cannot be planted. It is pointless for one to attempt to cut away the branches, if he does not make a strenuous effort to dig up the root.”<sup>132</sup>

Therefore, in Lombard, we find a vindication of crusades and inquisition against heretical groups (such as the Henricians and Cathars), which were already beginning to take place in western Europe.

As Augustine says, by his “hidden judgement is understood the pain, by which each one now is either disciplined unto purgation, or warned to conversion, or if he despise it, is blinded unto damnation,” And so God’s hidden judgement is called the pain by which he judges in purging, converting, blinding.<sup>133</sup>

Therefore while baptism was the symbol of the reception of regeneration, while the remaining six sacraments conferred the grace which they signified, and while love was a sign of the presence of the Holy Spirit, all of these could be lost, and were “often” lost. Hence, from Lombard’s *Sentences*, salvation, based on human effort and experience, could be lost.

### Conclusion

Two persons “being dead who still speak.” These are those “whose voice is not heard.” Their words have been eradicated, obeying the admonition in Deut 25:19, “you will blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven. You shall not forget.” Yet, by their silence, they still speak. They are Henry the Monk (d. 1148) and Joachim of Fiore (c. 1130–1202). Both crossed paths with Peter Lombard, if only in the ideological realm. One’s ministry was clearly against the sacraments (as the master of the *Sentences* described them) and the other was against Lombard’s distortion of the Trinity to achieve his rhetorical ends. This conclusion will focus solely on Joachim of Fiore, in conjunction with this paper’s theme on the Holy Spirit.

Joachim the Fiore found his place in Catholic church history by his partial condemnation at the Fourth Lateran Council. Joachim had apparently written *Tractatus sive libellus contra*

<sup>130</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 31, c 1, n 7), 130.

<sup>131</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 31, c 1, n 9), 130–31.

<sup>132</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 31, c 1, n 10), 131.

<sup>133</sup>Lombard [Eng] (Bk 4, D 46, c 2), 252.

*magistrum Petrum Lombardum*, which was condemned by that council. As part of Joachim's retraction, all copies of this tract were dutifully destroyed.<sup>134</sup> Hence, his voice does not speak; instead, we only read the citations of his accusers. Meanwhile, the council sided "with Peter Lombard."<sup>135</sup> According to this council, Joachim took issue with the sentence, "There is one supreme reality of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, and this does not beget and it does not proceed."<sup>136</sup> The council noted that Joachim accused Lombard of proposing a quaternity,<sup>137</sup> since, "the three persons in a way are a fourth which would be a common essence." This author found Joachim's assessment conceivable. Likewise, Warfield had stated that in Lombard, the Catholic church exchanged itself for the work of the Holy Spirit.<sup>138</sup> Likewise, as noted with many citations in the section above, Lombard seemed to have replaced the personal work of the Holy Spirit for the impersonal work of the "Undivided Trinity." If one also adds to this quaternity Lombard's division of Jesus into two beings, "Son of God" from all eternity and "Son of Man" from the womb of Mary, the divine essence becomes a quaternity. When Mary is understood as the mother of God in a wrong manner, then the Trinity becomes a hexternity.

<sup>134</sup>Ozilou, "Introduction" in *Pierre Lombard*, vol 1, 31–32.

<sup>135</sup>"Quant à nous, avec l'approbation du saint concile universel, nous croyons et confessons avec maître Pierre qu'il y a une seule réalité suprême, qui ne peut être saisie ni dite, qui est véritablement Père et Fils et Saint-Esprit, les trois personnes ensemble et chacune d'elles en particulier." ("As for us, with the approbation of the universal holy council, we believe and confess with Master Peter that there is only one supreme reality, that cannot be understood nor spoken, which is truly Father and Son and Holy Spirit, the three persons together and each one of them separate" [Fourth Lateran Council, Canon 2; DS 804]; translation mine).

<sup>136</sup>"Il y a une réalité suprême qui est Père et Fils et Saint-Esprit, et celle-ci n'engendre pas, n'est pas engendrée et ne procède pas" (DS 803; translation mine). "For there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the holy Spirit, and it neither begets nor is begotten nor does it proceed" (Canon 2, Fourth Lateran Council [1215]; Internet). "And so we also say that the divine essence did not generate an essence. Since the divine essence is one and the highest thing, if the divine essence generated an essence, then the same thing generated itself, which is not possible. But the Father alone begot the Son, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son" (Lombard [Eng] [Bk 1, D 5, c 1, n 6], 31–32). "Ainsi encore disons-nous que l'essence divine n'a pas engendré l'essence: étant donné en effet que l'essence divine est la seule réalité suprême, si l'essence divine a engendré l'essence, une même chose s'est engendrée elle-même, ce qui ne peut absolument pas être; mais le Père seul a engendré le Fils, et du Père et du Fils procède l'Esprit-Saint." ("Therefore again we say that the divine essence did not beget an essence: being given in effect that the divine essence is the only supreme reality, if the divine essence begets an essence, the same thing has begotten itself, which absolutely cannot be; but the Father only begot the Son, and the from the Father and the Son proceed the Holy Spirit" [Lombard [Fr] (Bk 1, D 5, c 1, n 6), 65 and 185–86]; translation mine).

<sup>137</sup>Lombard also used the term "Quaternity" in his Third Book, Lombard [Eng] (Bk 3, D 6, c 4, n 2), 28.

<sup>138</sup>Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation*, 79.

More importantly, why be so intentional to distort the Bible's mysterious conception of the Trinity? The purpose seems to be that Lombard was arguing a case for the seven sacraments as they are described in Book 4. "A little leaven leavens the whole lump" (1 Cor 5:6). It seems clear by the arrangement of the material that the purpose for the conjectures in Books 1–3 was to set the stage for the sacraments. In this way, Lombard was able to condemn as heretical:

- enlightenment types—those who feel that God the Holy Spirit speaks directly to the human soul by his words without the use of any physical sacrament;
- born-again types—those who believe that the Holy Spirit interacts with and regenerates individual souls solely accompanied by their faith alone and because of his grace alone;
- Spirit-filled types—those who accept that Christians can be literally "filled with the Spirit" as was exemplified in the Book of Acts;
- inerrantists—those who feel that the Holy Spirit spoke singly and authoritatively in, with, and by the words of the word of God, the canon of Scripture.

On the other hand, to be in right standing with Rome, must not all Catholic scholars after the Fourth Lateran Council submit to the doctrinal categories as laid out by Lombard? Did not Joachim of Fiore provide an example of dutiful submission to the pope when he turned over all his writings antagonistic toward Lombard?<sup>139</sup> Though Joachim's voice "is not heard" it "still speaks." And now, for the first time in 850 years, non-Latin English-readers can open the pages of Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences* and search for themselves.

---

<sup>139</sup>"If anyone therefore ventures to defend or approve the opinion or doctrine of the aforesaid Joachim on this matter, let him be refuted by all as a heretic. By this, however, we do not intend anything to the detriment of the monastery of Fiore, which Joachim founded, because there both the instruction is according to rule and the observance is healthy; especially since Joachim ordered all his writings to be handed over to us, to be approved or corrected according to the judgment of the apostolic see. He dictated a letter, which he signed with his own hand, in which he firmly confesses that he holds the faith held by the Roman church, which is by God's plan the mother and mistress of all the faithful" (Canon 2, Fourth Lateran Council [1215]; Internet).

## Did the Incarnation Introduce Change among the Persons of the Trinity?



**Adam Harwood, PhD**

*Adam Harwood is professor of theology, occupying the McFarland Chair of Theology; director of the Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry; and editor, Journal for Baptist Theology and Ministry at New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary.*  
aharwood@nobts.edu

**Note:** A version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society in San Antonio, Texas, on November 16, 2016.

Since the time of the early church, a strong intuition has existed within the Christian tradition to resist the notions that God either changes or suffers. Rather, God is (in qualified ways) both immutable and impassible. That is, he is unchanging in his nature, and he cannot be moved emotionally to act contrary to his plans.<sup>1</sup> The motivating concern has been to safeguard against any notion that God changes *in his being*, or in his character. After all, Scripture includes statements such as “I the Lord do not change” (Mal 3:6a) and “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever” (Heb 13:8).<sup>2</sup> God is presently, always has been, and always will be holy, loving, and just. In that sense, he is unchanging. Nevertheless, most who affirm that God is unchanging also believe God has acted in the world at various times, most decisively in the incarnation of the preexistent and eternal Son of God, Jesus. And many of the Christians who affirm God is impassible also affirm he is impassioned.<sup>3</sup> So, the view that God is *unchanging* should not be misinterpreted to mean God is *inactive* in the world. And the view that God does not alter his plans due to being emotionally moved does not rule out that he is sometimes emotionally moved. Instead, the assertions that God is unchanging and immovable deserve to be qualified to account for God’s acts in relation to his creation.<sup>4</sup>

This concern for divine immutability and impassibility becomes acute when considering the incarnation. Prior to the incarnation, the eternal Son had not been subjected to changes such as those that occurred in the person of Jesus, such as birth, growth, learning, suffering,

<sup>1</sup>See *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed., s.v. “impassibility of God,” and *The Lexham Glossary of Theology*, s.v. “immutability” and “impassibility.”

<sup>2</sup>Unless otherwise noted, biblical quotations are taken from the English Standard Version.

<sup>3</sup>See Rob Lister, *God is Impassible and Impassioned: Toward a Theology of Divine Emotion* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2013).

<sup>4</sup>For a treatment of the early history of the doctrine of impassability, see John Kenneth Mozley, *The Impassibility of God: A Survey of Christian Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926).

and dying. When the Word became flesh, however, the incorporeal became corporeal. The main question of this paper is whether this addition of true humanity to the second person of the Trinity resulted in the triune God sharing in experiences of change not previously possible for an incorporeal God (i.e., physical birth, growth, learning, and death). Can one maintain orthodox views of Christ and the Trinity while affirming that the incarnation introduced experiences of change via the person of Christ to the triune God?

So, the title of this paper doubles as its main question: Did the incarnation introduce change among the persons of the Trinity? This question was prompted when it was observed that several New Testament texts refer to apparent change experienced by Jesus Christ when he was born, then when he grew, learned, suffered, and died. I will attempt to answer this question within the theological boundaries of both a Chalcedonian Christology and perichoretic Trinity. Also, I will also attempt to clarify a key term (change) then consider God's relationship to his creation, time. I will conclude by suggesting an implication of the tentative answer. First, consider Scripture.

### New Testament Texts

Several New Testament texts refer to change experienced by Jesus, who is the eternal Son incarnate. Specifically, Jesus was born, then he grew, learned, suffered, and died. Consider the following examples (emphasis mine):

“And the Word **became flesh** and dwelt among us, and we have seen his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth.” – John 1:14

“But when the fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, **born** of woman, **born** under the law.” – Gal 4:4

“And Jesus **grew** in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.” – Luke 2:52 NIV<sup>5</sup>

“Although he was a son, he **learned** obedience through what he **suffered**.” – Heb 5:8

“And he (Jesus) said to them, ‘I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I **suffer**.’” – Luke 22:15

“God shows his love for us in that while we were still sinners, Christ **died** for us.” – Rom 5:8

“For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received: that Christ **died** for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures.” – 1 Cor 15:3

---

<sup>5</sup>The CEV, GNT, NCV, and NLT join the NIV in translating *proekopten* as “grew” in Luke 2:52. The ESV, HCSB, KJV, NET, and NRSV translate the word as “increased.” Johannes P. Louw and Eugene Albert Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1996), 154, define the verb *prokoptō* (13.57) as follows: “to change one’s state for the better by advancing and making progress.” Either term communicates the same basic meaning, which is that the child Jesus advanced physically, intellectually, and in favor with God and others.

If Jesus of Nazareth is correctly understood to be the Word enfleshed, then the preexistent and eternal Son was born of a woman (John 1:14; Gal 4:4), grew (Luke 2:52), learned (Heb 5:8), suffered (Luke 22:15; Heb 5:8), and died (Rom 5:8; 1 Cor 15:3). These verbs are predicated in the New Testament to the person of Jesus. The next section will provide theological boundaries by addressing the way many in the church articulate their understanding of the union of divinity and humanity in Christ as well as trinitarian relations.

## Theological Boundaries

### Chalcedonian Christology

The Council of Chalcedon (451) produced what might be considered the gold standard of theological formulations of hypostatic union. Oliver Crisp suggests the theological statements which constitute the Chalcedonian definition provide a “dogmatic minimalism,” framing the hypostatic union in broad terms while establishing boundaries that rule out unorthodox views. Crisp summarizes the tenets of Chalcedonian Christology as:

1. Christ is one person.
2. Christ has two natures, one divine and one human.
3. The two natures of Christ retain their integrity and are distinct; they are not mixed together or confused, nor are they amalgamated into a hybrid of divine and human attributes (like a demigod).
4. The natures of Christ are really united in the person of Christ; that is, they are two natures possessed by one person.<sup>6</sup>

Affirming two natures in one person has allowed the church to assert the one person of Christ was and is truly divine and truly human. However, this Chalcedonian division has resulted in the partitioning of the divine nature of Christ from suffering and death by predicating the possibility of change such as suffering and death to only the *human* nature of Christ. As Cyril of Alexandria (378–444) remarked, “He suffers in his own flesh, and not in the nature of Godhead.”<sup>7</sup> Many theologians follow this path. Tom McCall writes that Jesus Christ “suffers *according to his human nature*.” McCall explains, “His divinity was not

---

<sup>6</sup>Oliver D. Crisp, “Desiderata for Models of the Hypostatic Union,” in *Christology, Ancient & Modern: Explorations in Constructive Dogmatics*, ed. Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2013), 19–41. The four tenets are cited verbatim from pages 29 and 40. Crisp, 40, notes that the Chalcedonian statement fails to define either nature or person, and so he proposes this Chalcedonian Axiom: “Christ has one of whatever goes with the person and two of whatever goes with natures.”

<sup>7</sup>Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Unity of Christ*, trans. John A. McGuckin (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1995), 130.

subject to suffering as was his humanity, so there is a way in which his divinity is impassible while his humanity suffers.”<sup>8</sup>

Is it possible, however, to maintain a unified view of the person of Christ while stating that on the cross, the *humanity* of Christ died, but not the *divinity*? Like McCall, Wayne Grudem maintains the distinction between the natures but also affirms some kind of shared experience. Grudem explains that

in his human nature, Jesus died (Luke 23:46; 1 Cor. 15:3). But with respect to his divine nature, he did not die, but was able to raise himself from the dead. . . . Nevertheless, by virtue of union with Jesus’ human nature, his divine nature somehow tasted something of what it was like to go through death. The *person* of Christ experienced death. . . . Therefore, even though Jesus’ divine nature did not actually die, Jesus went through the whole experience of death as a whole person, and both human and divine natures somehow shared in that experience.<sup>9</sup>

If Grudem is correct that the suffering and death of Christ was experienced in the human nature of the person of Christ only, then the divine nature does not undergo death. However, as Grudem notes, because the person of Christ consists of *both* human and divine natures, the divine nature “shared” in the experience of death.

Alvin Plantinga arrives at a similar conclusion. He writes,

Can we say that Christ *qua* human being (according to his human nature) suffered while Christ *qua* divine (according to his divine nature) did not? This is hardly the place to try to address a question as ancient and deep as this one, but I’m inclined to think this suggestion incoherent. There is this person, the second person of the divine Trinity who became incarnate. It is this person who suffers; if there really were *two* centers of consciousness here, one suffering and the other not, there would be two persons here (one human and one divine) rather than one person who is both human and divine.<sup>10</sup>

Plantinga’s emphasis on the incarnation, suffering, and death as having occurred to one person is consistent with the present thesis. In the next section, I will consider the implication of this question for the doctrine of the Trinity.

### Perichoresis

God exists in one nature, or essence, and three eternal, uncreated persons who are identified in Scripture as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Father and the Spirit are distinct

---

<sup>8</sup>Thomas H. McCall, *Forsaken: The Trinity and the Cross, and Why It Matters* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012), 69. Italics in the original.

<sup>9</sup>Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994), 560. Emphasis his.

<sup>10</sup>Alvin Plantinga, *Knowledge and Christian Belief* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015), 77 n.9.

from and should not be confused with the person of the Son.<sup>11</sup> Even so, a stable intuition in the Christian tradition is that the persons of the Trinity share in some sense in the divine acts of the other persons. This has been called appropriation and seems to have been the view of Augustine, who explains the promise that the Father and the Son will make their abode with the one who keeps his word does not exclude the Holy Spirit.<sup>12</sup> Robert Letham's comments agree: "We know that in all the works of God, all three persons are inseparably involved, although each work is particularly attributable to one of the persons."<sup>13</sup> Similarly, Millard Erickson remarks that "the actions of any one of the persons of the Trinity are actually actions in which all three persons participate."<sup>14</sup> It seems common for Christian thinkers to affirm that the persons of the Trinity share in some sense in the divine acts of the other persons.

More than sharing in one another's acts, is it possible that the persons of the Trinity interpenetrate one another in their being? Perichoresis (from the Greek *perichōrēsis*, "a proceeding around") refers to the interpenetration, or mutual indwelling, of the three persons of the Trinity. The Latin theologians used the term *circumincessio* (which implies active participation) then *circuminsessio* (which implies indwelling).<sup>15</sup>

Is it possible that in their participation in the divine life as well as in their actions the Father and the Spirit shared in the temporal changes introduced by the events of the incarnation, life, and death of the divine-human person of Jesus? Erickson thinks this is the case. After he affirms that the works of the different persons of the Trinity are works of the triune God, he traces out this implication: "So, for example, it was the Son who died on the cross, but in a very real sense, the Father and the Spirit also suffered. This is not the ancient teaching of patripassianism. This is referring to the other persons' sympathetic suffering in the Son's actual suffering on the cross."<sup>16</sup> Erickson's denial of the Father's suffering but

---

<sup>11</sup>Without affirming or disaffirming the economic-immanent distinction, I will proceed assuming the persons of the Trinity share eternal relations.

<sup>12</sup>Augustine, *On the Trinity* 1.9.19 (NPNF 3:28), writes, "But in order to intimate the Trinity, some things are separately affirmed, the Persons being also each severally named; and yet are not to be understood as though the other Persons were excluded, on account of the unity of the same Trinity and the One substance and Godhead of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." William G. T. Shedd adds this explanatory footnote on the page: "An act belonging eminently and officially to a particular trinitarian person is not performed to the total *exclusion* of the other persons, because of the numerical unity of essence. The whole undivided essence is in each person; consequently, what the essence in one of its personal modes, or forms, does officially and eminently, is participated in by the essence in its other modes or forms. Hence the interchange of persons in Scripture." Emphasis his. See also John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2.12.2.

<sup>13</sup>Robert Letham, *The Message of the Person of Christ: The Word Made Flesh*, The Bible Speaks Today, ed. Derek Tidball (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2013), 183.

<sup>14</sup>Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2013), 308.

<sup>15</sup>See *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed., s.v. "circumincession."

<sup>16</sup>Millard J. Erickson, *Who's Tampering with the Trinity? An Assessment of the Subordination Debate*

affirmation that the Father experienced “sympathetic suffering” is consistent with the present thesis.

The view of Wolfhart Pannenberg, who served as Erickson’s postdoctoral mentor, suggests that the student is like his teacher. Pannenberg writes,

The passion of Jesus Christ is not an event which concerned only the human nature that the divine Logos assumed, as though it did not affect in any way the eternal placidity of the trinitarian life of God. . . . It is incorrect, of course, to speak point-blank of the death of *God* on the cross, as has been done since the time of Hegel. We can say only of the *Son of God* that he was ‘crucified, dead, and buried.’ To be dogmatically correct, indeed, we have to say that the Son of God, though he suffered and died himself, did so according to his human nature. . . . Nevertheless, we have to say that Jesus was affected by suffering and death on the cross in person, i.e., in the person of the eternal Son. . . . Nor can the Father be thought of as unaffected by the passion of his Son if it is true that God is love. . . . To this extent we may speak of the Father’s sharing of the suffering of the Son, his sym-path-y with the passion.<sup>17</sup>

If the persons of the Trinity share in the acts of one another, then would they have shared in the most significant act in history, the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus? If so, then did the triune God experience in some way the changes introduced by the incarnation? Once again, What is meant by the word *change*?

### A Key Term: Change

Thomas Aquinas provides three reasons God is altogether immutable. First, God is pure act, without any potentiality. Because anything that changes is potential, “it is impossible for God to be in any way changeable.” Second, because God is simple, or without parts, he cannot be moved. Third, things that move acquire something by their movement, but God is infinite and cannot acquire anything new. Thus he is immutable.<sup>18</sup> Even so, Thomas refers to the incarnate Son in ways that he is unwilling to speak of God. For example, he asks whether Christ has any acquired knowledge. He answers by quoting Heb 5:8 and explaining that “there was in the soul of Christ an empiric knowledge, which is acquired knowledge.”<sup>19</sup> Further, Thomas declares the body and soul of Christ were passible, and Christ could feel pain.<sup>20</sup> However, Thomas argues that “those things that belong to the Divine Nature are predicated of Christ in His Divine Nature, and those that belong to the

---

(Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2009), 135.

<sup>17</sup>Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 1:314.

<sup>18</sup>Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I.9.1 (in ed. trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province [New York: Benziger, 1947]), 90.

<sup>19</sup>Aquinas, *ST III.9.4*, p. 4709.

<sup>20</sup>Aquinas, *ST III.15.4–5*, pp. 4763, 4765.

human nature are predicated of Christ in His human nature.”<sup>21</sup> Similarly, “what belongs to one nature cannot be predicated of the other if they are taken in the abstract.” The upshot is that “in the mystery of the Incarnation we say that the Son of God suffered, yet we do not say that the Divine Nature suffered.”<sup>22</sup>

Paul Gavrilyuk examines early church writings on docetism, patripassianism, Arianism, and Nestorianism to argue for the qualified passibility and the impassibility of God. He explains,

Divine compassion presupposes both impassibility and passibility. It is the main contention of the patristic understanding of the incarnation that God, remaining fully divine, became human, accepted the limitations of human existence, subjected himself to voluntary suffering for the salvation of the world and triumphed over sin, death, and corruption in the end. God is impassible inasmuch as he is able to conquer suffering and he is passible inasmuch as he is able to suffer in and through human nature.<sup>23</sup>

Like the Christian tradition represented by Cyril and Aquinas, then restated by Grudem, McCall, and others, I affirm that the divine nature of Christ cannot die. It is difficult to conceive how an incorporeal nature could undergo a corporeal death. Nevertheless, like Grudem, Pannenberg, Plantinga, and others, I want to emphasize that the death of Christ was not experienced by a *nature* but by a *person*. Because the death of Christ was experienced by the unified person of Christ, it seems reasonable to say that the divine nature experienced to some degree the death of Christ. And because that incarnate, eternal Son is the same eternal Son who has existed from eternity with the other persons of the Godhead, then any experience of the Son would also be shared in a sympathetic way by the Father and the Spirit due to their shared being and personal life.

In his biblical theology of the incarnation, Graham Cole employs the image of God visiting our planet and asks a question similar to the main question of this paper. Cole asks, “If we indeed live on a visited planet, then did that event change God, and if so in what ways?” Cole offers three possible answers. First, the incarnation could have changed the being of God. Second, the incarnation could have changed the character of God by a matter of degree. Third, the answer he endorses, the incarnation should be understood as the assumption of manhood into God. He explains, “That is to say, the Trinity now relates to itself *qua* Trinity in a new way through the humanity of Christ.”<sup>24</sup> Cole appeals to Bruce

---

<sup>21</sup>Aquinas, *ST III.16.4*, pp. 4782–83.

<sup>22</sup>Aquinas, *ST III.16.5*, p. 4784.

<sup>23</sup>Paul L. Gavrilyuk, *The Suffering of the Impassible God: The Dialectics of Patristic Thought*, Oxford Early Christian Studies, ed. Gillian Clark and Andrew Louth (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 11.

<sup>24</sup>Graham A. Cole, *The God who became Human: A biblical theology of Incarnation*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 30, ed. D. A. Carson (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2013), 145–46. Italics not in the original.

Milne, who argues that the incarnation should not be understood as the Godhead minus, but God plus.<sup>25</sup> Cole explains, “The plus is the new way the Father, Son and Holy Spirit relate through the assumed humanity of the Son.” Cole adds, “The change is relational and permanent.”<sup>26</sup> Notice that Cole refers twice to the “new way” the Trinity relates to itself as a result of the incarnation. Cole even calls this a “change” that is both “relational and permanent.” Cole’s use of the word *change* and his observation that the Trinity relates to itself in a new way due to the incarnation are consistent with the present thesis.

### What is God’s Relationship to Time?

The question of God’s relationship to his creation is associated with the question of God’s relationship to time. If Augustine was correct in affirming that time is a creation of God,<sup>27</sup> then time is a category of God’s creation. Even if one does not affirm that God created time, the issues are related because God’s creation exists in time, and God has chosen to reveal himself to his creation in time.

Aquinas conceived distinctions among eternity, time, and aeviternity. Eternity has neither beginning nor end and is fitted for an immutable being such as God. Time has both a beginning and an end and is fitted for mutable beings such as humans. Aeviternity has a beginning but no end, and is fitted for heavenly bodies and heavenly angels which are both immutable in their being but mutable in their place and choices, respectively.<sup>28</sup> Although this idea was not observed in the *Summa*, Aquinas’s view of beings and existence is consistent with the idea that in the incarnation the eternal and immutable Son assumed some mutable properties in either aeviternity or time.<sup>29</sup>

Paul Helm proposes that God exists “timelessly eternally.” If God exists outside of time rather than inside of time, then the Creator/creature distinction is maintained. Further, the impassible God is eternally united with human nature in the person of Jesus Christ.<sup>30</sup> Although Helm’s view rightly notes that God exists in himself and is in no way dependent on his creation, Helm’s view leads to an uncommon view of the incarnation. Helm summarizes: “There is no time at which the Son of God exists in a preincarnate form.”<sup>31</sup> Although Helm’s

---

<sup>25</sup>Bruce Milne, *Know the Truth: A Handbook of Christian Belief* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009), 200.

<sup>26</sup>Cole, *The God who became Human*, 146.

<sup>27</sup>See Augustine, *Confessions* 11.

<sup>28</sup>Aquinas, *ST I.10.5*, p. 102–3.

<sup>29</sup>Thanks to Rhyné Putman for pointing me to both this text and this insight.

<sup>30</sup>Paul Helm, “Divine Timeless Eternity,” in *Four Views of God and Time*, ed. Gregory E. Ganssle (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001), 28–60.

<sup>31</sup>Helm, “Divine Timeless Eternity,” 55. See also p. 54, “One thing to note is that if God the Son is timelessly eternal and yet incarnate in Jesus Christ there is no time in his existence when he was not incarnate, though since he became incarnate at a particular time in our history there were times in

conclusion is unusual, it is a logical conclusion because if God is an eternal being who lives in an “eternal present,” then it is not possible to speak of moments before or after an event in the life of God.<sup>32</sup> In such a view, the eternal Son is *always* incarnate.

Carl F. H. Henry held a similar classical view of God as both impassible and timeless. He includes, however, important qualifications which account for God’s activity in history, especially concerning the incarnation. Henry explains that this “unchanging and unchangeable God” is “active in temporal processes and historical events, and in the incarnation steps personally into history.”<sup>33</sup> God is “static” in the sense that he is “unchanging,” but he is not “indifferent” to his creation.<sup>34</sup> This view maintains that God exists independently of his creation, but acts in creation to accomplish his sovereign purposes.<sup>35</sup>

Other models of God and time could be considered. The value for the present study is that the models of both Aquinas and Henry allow the possibility for an immutable God to enter time as the two-natured person of Jesus, who experienced change.

### Conclusion

If change can be defined as a person experiencing new relations or experiences, then the incarnation of the Word, or the addition of true humanity to the eternal Son of God, introduced change among the persons of the Trinity. At the incarnation, the Son of God was born of a woman (John 1:14; Gal 4:4). This Son grew (Luke 2:52), learned obedience by his suffering (Heb 5:8), and he died (1 Cor 15:3). These verbs—born, grew, learned, suffered, and died—are predicated in the New Testament to the person of Jesus, and they refer to acts which the *Logos asarkos* (“the Word without flesh”) had not experienced previously. Because of the interpenetration of the persons of the Trinity, the Father and Spirit participated in some way with the Son in these new relations and experiences. The second person of the Trinity *changed* at the incarnation when the Son (the divine Word) added a human nature to his divine nature. Prior to the incarnation, the Word had not become flesh.<sup>36</sup> The second person of the Trinity exists in eternal relationship with the

---

that history before the incarnation, and times since.”

<sup>32</sup>See Oliver D. Crisp, *The Word Enfleshed: Exploring the Person and Work of Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016), 10, who interacted with Helm’s view when Crisp argued for the eternal generation of the Son.

<sup>33</sup>Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation, and Authority* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1999), 5:292.

<sup>34</sup>Henry, *God, Revelation, and Authority*, 6:291.

<sup>35</sup>Henry, *God, Revelation, and Authority*, 5:12, 6:35–36. Henry is the representative figure for the transcendent-voluntarist model of divine love in John C. Peckham, *The Love of God: A Canonical Model* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015).

<sup>36</sup>Although it is possible that prior to his incarnation Christ appeared at times during the old covenant as “the angel of the LORD,” it is not clear that those *appearances* involved *incarnation*.

other members of the Trinity. Without any change in the *attributes* of the members of the Trinity (e.g., holiness, love, eternity, etc.), the Son related differently to the Father and the Spirit after his incarnation due to the changes mentioned in Scripture when Jesus was born then grew, learned, suffered, and died.

If the present thesis stands, then an important implication is that if the incarnation of the eternal Son introduced change within the triune God in the sense that the Father and the Spirit participated perichoretically in the human birth, growth, learning, suffering, and death of Jesus, then not only the Son but *all the members* of the triune Godhead can sympathize with the human condition.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>The implication that the triune God can sympathize with the human condition can be affirmed while disaffirming both a panentheistic and an openness view, which (respectively) confuse God with his creation and deny God's knowledge of the future.

---

I am thankful for the feedback on provided by colleagues Rex Butler, Rhyne Putman, Jeff Riley, and Bob Stewart, as well as Jim Gifford and Malcolm Yarnell. Any faults in this paper, of course, are mine alone.

## Unconditional Election and the Condemnation of Sinners: An Analysis of Eric Hankins’s View of Reprobation



Daniel Kirkpatrick, PhD

*Daniel Kirkpatrick is dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and assistant professor of Christian Studies serves at the University of the Southwest and Southeastern Baptist Association in Hobbs, New Mexico.  
dkirkpatrick@usw.edu*

In the Spring 2018 edition of the *Journal for Baptist Theology & Ministry*, Eric Hankins, pastor of First Baptist Fairhope, Alabama, wrote an article entitled “Romans 9 and the Calvinist Doctrine of Reprobation.”<sup>1</sup> As the title suggests, Hankins deals with what John Calvin called the “horrible decree” (*decretum quidem horribile*) of reprobation.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, it can be said that Hankins finds the decree more horrible than Calvin himself, given that he calls the church to reject it as non-biblical whereas Calvin called the church to embrace it as truth.<sup>3</sup> Hankins thus attempts to drive a stake into the very heart of the doctrine through exegesis of its primary proof-text, Rom 9. In his article, Hankins argues that Rom 9 does not mandate reprobation as the Calvinists describe it, and as it thus lacks sufficient biblical support it should be replaced with what he sees as clearer teachings of Scripture that fit the nature of God (namely, his universal love and redemptive plan for all people).<sup>4</sup>

Hankins’s article is to be commended in many respects. It is well written, carefully exegeted, and it makes a strong case from historical and literary contexts that the passage is not to be applied to people of all time but only a segment in human history. As a fellow non-Calvinist who rejects the notion of reprobation, I am sympathetic to many of Hankins’s conclusions. Yet, can more be said against the doctrine of reprobation itself? Might there be more alignment (and might concessions need to be made) on both sides of this delicate topic? In this article, I will attempt to explore Hankins’s critique of reprobation with a view to affirming unconditional election matched with a denial of reprobation.

### Defining Reprobation

While the focus of Hankins’s article is an exegetical analysis of Rom 9, his overall concern is the invalidity of the doctrine of reprobation itself. He begins by showing how

<sup>1</sup>Eric Hankins, “Romans 9 and the Calvinist Doctrine of Reprobation,” *Journal for Baptist Theology and Ministry* 15.1 (Spring 2018): 62–74.

<sup>2</sup>John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* 3.23.7.

<sup>3</sup>John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* 3.23.1; Hankins, “Romans 9,” 64.

<sup>4</sup>Hankins, “Romans 9,” 64–74.

Calvinists understand reprobation through one of its leading prophets, Wayne Grudem. Grudem defines reprobation as “the sovereign decision of God before creation to pass over some persons, in sorrow deciding not to save them, and to punish them for their sins, and thereby to manifest his justice.”<sup>5</sup> While Hankins is overtly critical of Calvinists at this juncture (not just the doctrine of reprobation), he rightly questions if this doctrine is fitting to the biblical narrative. If, as Hankins affirms, reprobation falls, Calvinism will need revision.<sup>6</sup> Can more be said against reprobation in addition to what Hankins brings out?

Louis Berkhof, a Reformed theologian, highlights how reprobation is understood in a twofold way. On the one hand, reprobation is often thought of passively whereby God merely passes over certain individuals based upon his sovereign choice, thereby denying them the capacity to believe.<sup>7</sup> This is how Grudem defined it above. In short, humans are by nature depraved and incapable of coming to faith in Christ on their own (a maxim upheld by all non-Pelagians). Yet, in this view, God does not extend a universal, prevenient and *regenerative* grace to all people thereby (seemingly arbitrarily) choosing to intervene in some people’s hearts to the neglect of others. However, the other way of commonly understanding reprobation is more active in nature. In this perspective, God predestines individuals to dishonor and wrath to establish his justice.<sup>8</sup> Therein, God has sovereignly and unilaterally determined one’s eternal estate apart from foreseen faith or works. The condemned (or reprobates), in this view, are actively predestined by God to eternal torment, and so they might be shown to be vessels of God’s justice no grace is afforded to them.

As noted above, Grudem—who rejects active reprobation, also called *double predestination*<sup>9</sup>—holds only to the first (passive) view, and it is primarily this first view that Hankins addresses in his article (though Hankins holds both views with equal contempt).<sup>10</sup> Yet, the strength of Hankins’ article lies more with the deconstruction of the second, active

---

<sup>5</sup>Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994), 685, quoted in Hankins, “Romans 9,” 62.

<sup>6</sup>Hankins, “Romans 9,” 63.

<sup>7</sup>Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), 116. See also W. S. Reid, “Reprobation,” in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1984), 319, who defines reprobation in that way and whom Hankins, “Romans 9,” cites on p. 62.

<sup>8</sup>Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 116.

<sup>9</sup>Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 670, 686. Therein, Grudem defines double predestination as a predestination for reprobation, which makes God, not the sinner, the cause of one’s eternal torment.

<sup>10</sup>Hankins, “Romans 9,” 62, is critical of the view that “God has determined not to give this certain group of individuals the grace and faith necessary for salvation. . . . He withholds grace and faith from them simply because it brings him the most glory.” However, in footnote 2, Hankins shows familiarity with the active form of reprobation and associates it with the passive form of reprobation leading one to conclude he opposes all notions of reprobation, whether passive or active. See also Hankins, “Commentary on Article 6: Election to Salvation,” in *Anyone Can Be Saved: A Defense of ‘Traditional’ Southern Baptist Soteriology*, ed. David L. Allen, Eric Hankins, and Adam Harwood (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016), 91, where he is expressly critical of active reprobation.

type of reprobation. Hankins writes that God's act of hardening the unbelieving Jews is partial and temporary, not permanent.<sup>11</sup> He demonstrates that their condemnation was not something foreordained in eternity past but a temporary hardening until the Gentiles' provocation to the Jews was complete.<sup>12</sup> He states that Rom 9–11 does not apply to all people for all time but to a specific people at a specific time. While Hankins should have anticipated and reconciled how the saving promises of God mentioned in Rom 10:9 and other verses are universal in scope when the condemnatory statutes are specific to a people and time, he nonetheless made a firm argument that reprobation cannot be substantiated by Rom 9. Even so, can more be said about the flaws of active and passive reprobation?

### Framing Reprobation

A common criticism against active reprobation is that it makes God the author of evil and culpable of moral failure that goes against his right moral nature.<sup>13</sup> This accusation, despite the attempts of many holding to a “two wills of God” approach, has never been satisfactory for theologians like Hankins.<sup>14</sup> When analyzing active reprobation, it does appear that God would be the cause of one's eternal demise. R. C. Sproul defines double predestination as “God's decreeing from all eternity that certain unfortunate people are destined for damnation.”<sup>15</sup> Notice the cause of condemnation, according to Sproul, is not the sinner but God. Why are sinners in hell, according to this view? According to the critique of Hankins and Kenneth Keathley, it is because God simply did not want to save them.<sup>16</sup> While some concession can be made to the Calvinists on this point that God would be perfectly just in condemning all sinners to hell, what cannot be as easily conceded is that God would not be condemning all sinners to hell *for their sins only*. Rather, God would be condemning all sinners because *he chose* for them to go to hell.

As I have written elsewhere, soteriology is well served through an analysis of causation. Specifically, attention needs to be given to the efficient cause (the source or agent who brings about the change) and the instrumental cause (a secondary cause that produces the effect which owes its efficacy to the efficient cause).<sup>17</sup> If one were to hold to active reprobation as defined above, God would be the efficient cause of their eternal punishment.

---

<sup>11</sup>Hankins, “Romans 9,” 68, 70–72.

<sup>12</sup>Hankins, “Romans 9,” 68–70.

<sup>13</sup>Jerry L. Walls, “Divine Commands, Predestination, and Moral Intuition,” in *The Grace of God and the Will of Man*, ed. Clark H. Pinnock (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 1995), 273–74. See also Roger E. Olson, *Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006), 108–11.

<sup>14</sup>Hankins, “Romans 9,” 63.

<sup>15</sup>R. C. Sproul, *What is Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1997), 157.

<sup>16</sup>Kenneth Keathley, *Salvation and Sovereignty: A Molinist Approach* (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2010), 58. See also Hankins, “Romans 9,” 62.

<sup>17</sup>Daniel Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism? Is Salvation Cooperative or the Work of God Alone?* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2018), 17.

The instrumental cause would be God's immutable decrees, as expressed through the hardening of the individual's heart. The effect would be the person's eternal condemnation. Calvinists attempt to escape this dilemma through rationales of the two wills of God, yet even in doing such God remains the efficient and instrumental cause of one's condemned state, not the sinner. While it is conceivable that God would wish to reprobate actively certain sinners to establish his justice, it is not mandated, for God would still be able to demonstrate his justice on those who went to hell based upon their own disobedience and rejection of the gospel. Further, the clearer teaching of Scripture is that sinners are in hell because of their sin and lack of faith in Christ's atoning sacrifice (Luke 13:27–28; John 3:18; Rom 2:6–8; 6:23; Rev 21:8), not because God foreordained their demise.

What is one to make of the *passive* perspective of reprobation? Is it, as Hankins claims, "The necessary corollary to the doctrine of unconditional election"?<sup>18</sup> The claim, as it goes, is that if God elected individuals apart from foreseen faith, merit, or any other condition other than his sovereign will, those who are non-elect are essentially passed over and reprobated just as if they had been *actively* reprobated. As Hankins asserts, the non-elect are people who have never been, nor will they ever be, objects of saving love because God has chosen not to give them the grace and faith required for their salvation.<sup>19</sup>

If one were to hold to Hankins's line of reasoning here (which is in alignment with Grudem's definition of reprobation), God would be the efficient cause of a sinner's eternal demise. God foreordained not only the terms of election but the very people within election, meaning that God was the efficient cause of the damnation of the sinner. The instrumental cause would be the lack of God's love, care, or concern for them. God simply did not want them to be redeemed. While one could conceive a difference between active and passive reprobation in this line of argumentation, the two essentially arrive at the same conclusion: God is the cause of sinners going to hell.

As mentioned above, God ought not to be construed as the author of evil or any immoral action. If God were in any way the cause of someone's sin, which led to their respective condemnation, then God would be culpable of an immoral act. This is not to assume that God would be guilty in leaving sinners in and punishing them for their own sin, for this means that one's condemnation was caused by their own disobedience rather than the causes of God. Yet, this highlights the very tensions between election and condemnation. Hankins believes election must be conditional so that individuals may be condemned based on their own actions, not the actions of God, yet is this necessary and most reflective of the biblical record? Here we will explore how one can hold to unconditional election while rejecting reprobation in light of the biblical record.

---

<sup>18</sup>Hankins, "Romans 9," 62.

<sup>19</sup>Hankins, "Romans 9," 62.

### The Causes of Election and Condemnation

Hankins affirms with many Calvinists that election has unconditional elements to it. God does not elect persons based upon foreseen behavior, but because of his freedom, grace, and love, which did occur from eternity.<sup>20</sup> Yet, such election also happens in time, when someone places his or her faith in Christ for salvation. Hankins draws on the work of Keathley to advocate for a concurrent view of election, which addresses the timing of election. God sovereignly chose to elect apart from any obligation, yet for election to be actualized, one must place his or her faith in Christ.<sup>21</sup> The non-elect are none other than those who refuse to place their faith in Christ. It is here that Hankins finds the major flaw in Calvinism. If God elects based upon “inscrutable decrees,” then human responsibility and freedom are diminished.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, if one wants to be among the elect, he or she needs only to profess faith in Christ for salvation.

While due consideration needs to be afforded to Keathley’s view of concurrence and that Hankins never expressly affirms conditional election, his notion that one must place faith in Christ in order to become elect is reflective of conditional election. For one to belong to the corporate body of the elect, he or she needs to place his or her faith in Christ for salvation. Hankins states,

The phrase “God chose me” can only mean that God has always planned to bring salvation to sinners in a way that takes seriously both their radical sinfulness and their responsibility to respond in faith. It cannot mean that God chooses some and not others without respect to their response of faith to the gospel.<sup>23</sup>

All are savable in Hankins’s view, and individuals can belong to the elect if they place their faith in Christ. While not clearly stated as such, this means that the condition of one’s election is belief in Christ (i.e., conditional election). While not lacking in biblical references, the ultimate rationale for affirming this view is to make human beings, not God, the respective cause of both sin and condemnation. It is for good reason that the Reformed hold to unconditional election, and it is possible to hold to it without making God the cause of either sin or the sinner’s condemnation.

---

<sup>20</sup>Hankins, “Election to Salvation,” 97.

<sup>21</sup>Hankins, “Election to Salvation,” 96–97. Hankins interacts with Kenneth Keathley, “The Work of God: Salvation,” in *A Theology of the Church*, rev. ed., ed. Daniel L. Akin (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2014), 543–600.

<sup>22</sup>Hankins, “Election to Salvation,” 100.

<sup>23</sup>Hankins, “Election to Salvation,” 100. Hankins also states that election is based upon “God’s absolute foreknowledge of the free decisions of his creatures,” 92. Again, election is contingent upon foreseen faith which is essentially the conditional election argument.

Here one returns to the notion of causation. What activity caused a given effect in the aspect of election? In the conditional election view, God is rightly perceived as the efficient cause.<sup>24</sup> What is the instrumental cause of election in Hankins's view? It would be the faith of an individual. God will not elect unless one shows faith. The activity of faith, an action done by the person, is a condition which must be met for the effect of election to occur. While God may be the efficient cause of election, it must be matched with the human activity of faith for the effect of election to be realized. The Reformed are quick to be critical of this view, for it makes faith causative.<sup>25</sup> For the Reformed, one's election in Christ cannot be either sourced or based upon anything done by an individual, for then such would not be based entirely upon the grace of God but the actions (even if enabled by prevenient grace) of the human.<sup>26</sup> While Calvinists are quick to affirm salvation is by faith, it is not because of faith. Faith cannot be construed as causative, for this would make faith a work which causes an outcome. Rather, faith is a receptive instrument by which God gives his gracious salvation to undeserving sinners.<sup>27</sup> If one must meet the condition of being elected, one may rightly say that he or she was an instrumental cause of the election. It is one thing to say that God unconditionally elects and (as a result of that election) one places faith in Christ (unconditional election), yet it is quite another to say that God will choose only those who choose Christ (conditional election). Moreover, if one's election is dependent upon faith, then it makes sense that one's lapse in faith would make someone lose his or her election (and salvation). While space limitations do not permit this thought to be drawn out in its entirety, one may concede the point that the Reformed have good reason to hold to the unconditional nature of election so that faith is not causative of any aspect of salvation.<sup>28</sup> While not all may agree that election is unconditional in nature, this article is merely making the argument that one can have a good reason for holding to the unconditional nature of election. Now, should one ascribe to the unconditional nature of election, does that automatically assume reprobation as Hankins claims? The answer is, "No."

### Unconditional Election and Just Condemnation

As stated above, to affirm active reprobation (or double predestination) is to say that God is the efficient and/or instrumental cause of one's condemnation. Scripture, on the

<sup>24</sup>Hankins, "Election to Salvation," 94–95.

<sup>25</sup>See Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism?* 63–68, 77–83.

<sup>26</sup>Carl R. Trueman, *Grace Alone: Salvation as a Gift of God*, The Five Solas Series, ed. Matthew Barrett (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2017), 41–44.

<sup>27</sup>Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism?* 39–44. I am not here dealing with the delicate and debated issue of whether faith itself is a gift given only to the elect; rather, I am affirming with both Reformed and non-Reformed that faith cannot be causative, but solely receptive, in nature.

<sup>28</sup>Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism?* 77–84. See also Kenneth Keathley, a non-Reformed theologian, who upholds unconditional election and faith as instrumentally receptive, not causative, in nature in "The Work of God: Salvation," 567, 577–578.

other hand, places the blame upon the responsible sinner. First Peter 1:17 states that God judges people according to what they have done. Colossians 3:25 tells of the wrongdoers being punished for their own sinful activity. Revelation 20:11–15 speaks of the eternal punishment of people for their disobedience in life. An exhaustive list of references is not mandated at this point, given that Calvinists and non-Calvinists can agree upon this point. People are judged and condemned for their unbelief and their sin, according to Scripture's testimony. What this therefore implies is that the human is the efficient cause of his or her condemnation, and the instrumental causes of condemnation are their willful defiance of God, sin, and unbelief. Scripture gives no clear teaching of God being the cause of a person's sin. Individuals are judged based upon what they have done (sins of commission) and things they have not done (sins of omission). While God is no doubt the efficient cause of judgment (as the one who serves as the judge), he (like earthly judges) did not cause the offense but merely presides and passes verdict over the offense. God incurs no sin or blame.

What is to be said of passive reprobation, which Hankins criticizes? Is Grudem correct to hold to a notion of reprobation where God (seemingly arbitrarily) chooses some individuals for eternal life while passing by others unto eternal death? What is interesting to note is that Calvinists can furnish no clear scriptural support for a "passing over" activity of God. Rather, it is logical inference on their part. As Michael Horton, a staunch Calvinist, affirms, Rom 8:29 states it is *those* whom God foreknew who were predestined to salvation, not *that* which God foreknew (foreseen faith, merit, etc.).<sup>29</sup> The logical inference, then, is that those who are not elect were merely passed over and left in their helpless estate.

However, Scripture nowhere says God passes over some people for salvation. Rather, it is an *apologia* on behalf of Calvinists to explain why some are elect and others are not. The problem with this view, especially as Hankins puts it, is not only its lack of scriptural support but the fact that God, once again, is attributed to be the cause of one's eternal condemnation.<sup>30</sup> Why are some in hell? The reason is that God did not want them, did not choose them, and arbitrarily abandoned them to their helpless estate. Once again, Scripture attributes the cause of one's condemnation to the sinner, not to God. As such, if active and passive reprobation cannot be biblically supported, they should be rejected.

However, this line of argumentation alone does not solve the issue. Does not adhering to unconditional election (as proposed in this article) logically necessitate reprobation? Hankins says it is a "necessary corollary" because in unconditional election, God determines not to give certain persons the grace and faith needed to become saved.<sup>31</sup> Instead, they are left in their helpless estate, bound and blinded by their depravity, and unable to believe in

---

<sup>29</sup>Michael Horton, *For Calvinism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011), 58.

<sup>30</sup>Hankins, "Romans 9," 63–64.

<sup>31</sup>Hankins, "Romans 9," 62.

Christ unto salvation because God withheld from them such grace. One author, writing in support of a statement crafted by Hankins, describes the scenario in this way: God requires an individual to believe for salvation, but he denies the person the ability to believe and correspondingly condemns the individual for failing to believe.<sup>32</sup> Sinners are bound and enslaved to their will, and God is powerful enough to change them. Yet, he denies them the very ability. Steve Lemke draws this out to the conclusion that it ultimately makes God the author of evil. Lemke compares it to a fireman who goes into an orphanage which is on fire. The children cannot save themselves, so the firefighter goes into the orphanage and takes out three of the thirty children. Though he could go back in and rescue more, he is content to have saved the three. While the deed was heroic, one would question his character if it was within his power to save more. When related to soteriology, God may randomly and unconditionally elect to save some, and leave the rest to destruction, but it raises objections to his overall goodness.<sup>33</sup> It is understandable, when defined in these terms, why some would believe unconditional election necessitates reprobation; however, does it logically and biblically mandate it?

The traditional, Augustinian doctrine of sin does not portray sinners in quite the same helpless situation as some describe. While they are indeed helpless to save themselves (something held by all non-Pelagians), they are not victims in this scenario. They are rebels against the true King. It is by their own free will and accord that they turn away from God (John 3:19–20). While Rom 1 affirms that God gave certain people over to a depraved mind, Paul makes sure to affirm that they are without excuse (v. 20) because they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him but became futile in mind (v. 21). They chose to exchange the glory of God for material things. God gave them up in the lusts of their flesh, and as a result, God gave them up to dishonorable passions. Notice the cause and effect relationship here. A sinner, as an efficient cause, was the sole source and responsible party for the guilt incurred. The instrumental cause was the various acts of disobedience. The effect was their own depravity, and the outcome was their condemnation.

Sinners are not like orphans in a burning building. They are not helpless victims who perhaps inwardly desire to be redeemed in Christ yet lack the capacity to do it. They do not want to be saved from their sin, only the consequence of their sin. While they do not want to go to hell, they do not want the Lordship of Jesus Christ. In all ways, sinners are to be blamed for their sentence to hell. This means that sinners are justly condemned for their sins, for they alone are the cause of their disobedience, not God.

---

<sup>32</sup>Braxton Hunter, “Commentary on Article 8: The Free Will of Man,” in *Anyone Can Be Saved*, 121–22, 125–26.

<sup>33</sup>Steve W. Lemke, “A Biblical and Theological Critique of Irresistible Grace,” in *Whosoever Will: A Biblical-Theological Critique of Five-Point Calvinism*, ed. David L. Allen and Steve W. Lemke (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2010), 148–49.

An additional concern is raised at this point. If all people are so depraved (as Hankins also affirms) and are incapable of believing in Christ for salvation by nature, then why does God transform the hearts of some people and not all? Does this not raise issues of unfairness and injustice? Is this not fancy rhetoric that ultimately agrees with reprobation? Is this not the same thing as passive reprobation, whereby God merely passes by some, not giving them the capacity to believe when it is within his ability to do so? Naturally, these questions require lengthy responses which cannot be fully explored here, though some considerations may be made.<sup>34</sup>

First, affirming conditional election as a means of solving the issue has already been shown to be problematic, for it makes faith a cause of one's salvation. Our activities, even if they are divinely enabled, cannot cause the effect of salvation as a whole or an aspect in particular. Our election is secured because it rests in God, not us, and as such, it is owed all to grace. Second, even if God did arbitrarily pass by some (which it has been argued above that there is no biblical account of God passing by individuals), he would still not be the cause of their sinful condition. Again, Scripture portrays humanity as responsible for their sin and lack of belief, not God. If one should define *passing by* as the act of leaving someone in their full, willful rebellion and defiance, choosing not to save them, so be it; however, non-Calvinists affirm as much because they affirm God chooses to allow sinners to do exactly what they choose to do, remain sinfully and stubbornly defiant over and against the saving promises of God.

Yet, to what is perhaps the heart of the issue, if one were to hold to unconditional election (as is argued here), one would have to hold that God transforms the hearts of the elect only and not all people, though Scripture teaches his universal love for all people and ability to save the entire human race. Is there not injustice with God in the act of transforming the hearts of some to believe in Christ for salvation and not do so for all?

While I concede that God does permit some sinners to remain in their willful state of sin and not transform their hearts to believe in Christ for salvation (like he does for the elect), I do not view such as reprobation because the sinner remains the efficient and instrumental cause of their demise. What about the issue of injustice with God? I will close with these two final observations.

First, the non-Calvinist has not escaped a similar dilemma. If, as Hankins affirms, God foreknows the future and that election is contingent upon faith, God would then be choosing to create people he foreknows would not place their faith in Christ. It is within his power not to create them, yet—with the knowledge that they will spend eternity in hell—God creates them, anyway. Why would God do so? Some appeal to mystery and hidden knowledge without abandoning the doctrines of God's omniscience and God's universal

---

<sup>34</sup>For an address of some of these issues, see Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism?* 263–66.

love for all humanity.<sup>35</sup> Perhaps the same arguments can be made in response to why God transforms the hearts of some and not others.

Second, God has created other free agents called angels, who have the capacity to sin. For those who rebelled and became demons, God sent to hell to await their final condemnation (2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6). God afforded no opportunity for them to be saved. Satan's act of rebellion caused him to fall from heaven (Luke 10:18) and be destined for the lake of fire (Rev 20:10). Why did God not extend saving grace to the demons when it was in his power to do so? Why did the cross of Christ not atone for demonic sin? Why would he leave them in their own willful depravity and choose not to grant them the opportunity to be made right with him? I have no idea, but I do not question that my God has his reasons.<sup>36</sup> As such, there are things that are best left to mystery, yet we need not question God's goodness.

### Conclusion

This article has explored the claims of Eric Hankins, who claimed that unconditional election necessitates reprobation. It attempted to define more thoroughly the twofold perspective of reprobation to deny both based on human sinfulness as efficient and instrumental causes. Further, it attempted to show that one could hold to the unconditional nature of election without succumbing to reprobation.

---

<sup>35</sup>See Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism?* 265, and Greg Welty, "Election and Calling: A Biblical Theological Study," in *Calvinism: A Southern Baptist Dialogue*, ed. E. Ray Clendenen and Brad J. Waggoner (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2008), 230. See also Keathley, "The Work of God: Salvation," 566–67, who observes this is a difficult dilemma for all non-Calvinists.

<sup>36</sup>See Kirkpatrick, *Monergism or Synergism?* 265–66.

## “Worse than Idle” or “Mysteries of the Gospel”: John Albert Broadus and Benjamin Keach on Interpreting and Preaching the Parables of Jesus



H. Jared Bumpers, PhD

*H. Jared Bumpers is assistant professor of preaching and ministry at Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Kansas City, Missouri.  
jbumpers@mbts.edu*

The parables of Jesus have received much attention in recent years.<sup>1</sup> There is general scholarly consensus regarding their significance. David Wenham argued, “Jesus’ parables . . . were part and parcel of his whole ministry; they were a forceful and visual demonstration of what he had come to do.”<sup>2</sup> Klyne Snodgrass agreed, “Jesus’ parables are among the best known and most influential stories in the world. . . . The importance of the parables of Jesus can hardly be overestimated.”<sup>3</sup> The parables of Jesus were central to his teaching ministry, and any scholarly discussion of the life and ministry of Jesus must take their significance into account.

In spite of general agreement on the importance of the parables, there is little agreement on the interpretation of parables.<sup>4</sup> C. H. Dodd discussed the interpretation of parables and admitted, “Here there is no general agreement.”<sup>5</sup> Until the late nineteenth century, the dominant approach to interpreting the parables was allegorization.<sup>6</sup> The publication of Adolf Jülicher’s two-volume work on the parables changed the interpretive landscape.<sup>7</sup> Jülicher “rejected allegory and allegorizing . . . vehemently” and argued parables “were simple comparisons,” “self evident,” and intended to teach one point . . . a general religious

<sup>1</sup>Craig L. Blomberg noted that “more studies of the parables have been produced” during the last century “than those for any other section of comparable length in the Bible.” Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990), 13.

<sup>2</sup>David Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1989), 14.

<sup>3</sup>Klyne R. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 1.

<sup>4</sup>For a thorough treatment of the history of the interpretation of parables, see Warren S. Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1979); Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990), 29–167; and Klyne Snodgrass, “From Allegorizing to Allegorizing: A History of the Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus,” in *The Challenge of Jesus’ Parables*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 3–29.

<sup>5</sup>C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1961), 1.

<sup>6</sup>Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 5.

<sup>7</sup>Adolf Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 2 vols. (1910; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969).

maxim.”<sup>8</sup> Although Jülicher’s work has been challenged and his positions have been largely abandoned, his view “set a framework within which parable interpretation still operates.”<sup>9</sup> The majority of contemporary interpreters have followed Jülicher in rejecting allegorical interpretation and viewing parables as simple comparisons intended to teach one main point.<sup>10</sup> Yet a minority of scholars acknowledge at least some allegorical elements in Jesus’s parables and are open to the possibility of individual parables making more than one main point.<sup>11</sup>

One of the areas most affected by the lack of agreement among scholars is the field preaching. How are preachers to interpret and preach the parables? Is allegorical interpretation valid? If so, does each element within the parable signify a deep spiritual truth? If not, what role do the details of the parable play in its interpretation? Do the parables convey one primary point, or do they convey multiple points? All of these questions are important, and the answers to these questions will greatly shape a preacher’s interpretive approach to Jesus’s parables. The impact of a preacher’s interpretive approach to parables as it relates to preaching may be most evident in the writings and sermons of two key figures in Baptist history, John Albert Broadus (1827–1895) and Benjamin Keach (1640–1704).<sup>12</sup>

John Broadus and Benjamin Keach are two colossal figures in Baptist history. Although they were not contemporaries, Broadus was familiar with Keach’s works. In his classic

---

<sup>8</sup>Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 5.

<sup>9</sup>Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 6.

<sup>10</sup>Craig L. Blomberg, *Preaching the Parables* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2004), 14. Two other scholars, in addition to Jülicher, have significantly impacted the contemporary approach to interpreting the parables: C. H. Dodd and Joachim Jeremias. Herman Hendrickx contended, “It was Charles H. Dodd (1935) and Joachim Jeremias (1947) who substantially advanced the study of parables by, on the one hand, overcoming the exaggerations of Jülicher’s reaction and, on the other hand, studying the parables in the setting of the life of Jesus.” Herman Hendrickx, *The Parables of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1986), 13. For the works of Dodd and Jeremias, see Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, and Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 2nd ed. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1954).

<sup>11</sup>Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 21. Blomberg fits into this category, as does Snodgrass. This is not to say that Blomberg and Snodgrass agree on every point. Snodgrass rejected Blomberg’s view of parables as a literary genre, arguing they should be considered a literary mode, but he did “agree that parables may be allegorical and have more than one point.” Klyne Snodgrass, “From Allegorizing to Allegorizing,” 20.

<sup>12</sup>A brief biographical sketch of each Baptist figure will be provided later in the article. For a more detailed look at each of these men, see Archibald Thomas Robertson, *Life and Letters of John Albert Broadus* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1910); David S. Dockery and Roger D. Duke, eds., *John A. Broadus: A Living Legacy* (Nashville, TN: B & H, 2008); Thomas Crosby, *The History of the English Baptists*, vol. 4 (London: 1740), 268–314; Austin Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 2nd rev. ed. (Dundas, ON: Joshua Press, 2015); and Tom Nettles, “Benjamin Keach,” in *The Baptists*, vol. 1 (Fearn, Scotland: Christian Focus Publications, 2006), 1:163–93.

commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, Broadus interacted with Keach's *Exposition of the Parables*.<sup>13</sup> Broadus took a more cautious approach to interpreting and preaching parables than Keach, generally avoiding allegorization and typically deriving one main point from each parable.<sup>14</sup> Broadus described the practice of finding spiritual significance in every detail as "worse than idle."<sup>15</sup> Keach, on the other hand, attempted to follow Jesus, who "opens every particular part, and applies it" in his explanation of the parables.<sup>16</sup> Keach believed the parables "contained the profound and deep things or mysteries of the Gospel" and sought to find these mysteries in the particular details of every text.<sup>17</sup> The remainder of this article will focus on the diverging interpretive approaches of John Broadus and Benjamin Keach, paying special attention to the impact of their hermeneutical methodology on their preaching and drawing out implications for contemporary preachers who desire to faithfully interpret and preach the parables of Jesus.

### **Benjamin Keach: *Gospel Mysteries Unveil'd*<sup>18</sup>**

Benjamin Keach was a Particular Baptist preacher who ministered in Great Britain during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Keach has been described as one of the leading Baptist theologians of his era.<sup>19</sup> He is often remembered for his hymnology, but he was also a faithful pastor and expositor. His work on preaching from the types and metaphors of the Bible, as well as his expositions from the parables, is a classic.<sup>20</sup> This section will provide

---

<sup>13</sup>John Albert Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, American Commentary on the New Testament (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1886), 15, and Benjamin Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* (repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1977). Although he only mentions Keach once, the specific reference to Keach reveals Broadus's familiarity with Keach's work on the parables.

<sup>14</sup>Broadus did recognize the allegorical nature of many parables, as well as the allegorical approach of Jesus's interpretations in Matt 13, but he was generally cautious, observing, "The tendency has usually been towards the extreme of giving a separate spiritual meaning to every detail." Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 284.

<sup>15</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 501. The specific context of the quote is Broadus's explanation of the parable of the ten virgins. He wrote, "To find some separate spiritual meaning in the lamps, the vessels, the oil, and the sellers of oil, etc., seems here worse than idle." Broadus chided Keach for counting thirteen items of spiritual significance in the parable. Broadus's interpretation of the Parable of the Ten Virgins will be compared to Keach's exposition later in this article.

<sup>16</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

<sup>17</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 1.

<sup>18</sup>The original title of Keach's *Exposition of the Parables* was *Gospel Mysteries Unveil'd* (London, 1704).

<sup>19</sup>Michael Mullet, "Radical Sets and Dissenting Churches, 1600–1750," in *A History of Religion in Britain: Practice and Belief from Pre-Roman Times to the Present*, ed. Sheridan Gilley and W. J. Sheils (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 205. J. Barry Vaughn placed Keach "at the center of Baptist life in London between his arrival there in 1668 and his death in 1704." See J. Barry Vaughn, "Benjamin Keach," in *Baptist Theologians*, ed. Timothy George and David Dockery (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1990), 49.

<sup>20</sup>Benjamin Keach, *Preaching from the Types and Metaphors of the Bible* (repr., Grand Rapids, MI:

a brief biographical sketch of Keach's life and an overview of his interpretive approach to the parables.

### *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*<sup>21</sup>

Benjamin Keach was born on February 29, 1640, in North Buckinghamshire. Keach was baptized as an infant and raised in the Anglican church, but he was converted at age fifteen and joined a General Baptist church. Roughly three years after his conversion and baptism, two significant events occurred; he was called to preach, and he married Jane Grove. Keach spent the rest of his life preaching the gospel, and for the entirety of their marriage, Jane supported her husband's ministry. Even when Keach faced opposition and persecution, she stood by his side.<sup>22</sup> She also gave birth to five children, three of whom survived infancy. Tragically, she passed away in 1670, shortly after the family moved to London.<sup>23</sup> In 1672, Keach married Susannah Partridge, and the couple were married until Keach's death in 1704.

From the time of his move to London in 1668 until his death, Keach served as the pastor of a church on Tooley Street in London. Eventually, the church would move to Horseleydown, but the congregation was the same. There was a change, however, in Keach's theological views. Keach had been associated with General Baptist churches until his move to London, but at some point after his move, Keach embraced Particular Baptist views. Nettles suggested the change in Keach's theological position was due to his study of the Bible and his conversations with particular Baptist ministers in London.<sup>24</sup> Regardless of what caused the shift, Keach had become an ardent defender of Particular Baptist views by 1672.

Keach ministered faithfully to his Particular Baptist congregation at Horseleydown in London until his death in 1704. He heartily affirmed the inspiration, inerrancy, and authority of Scripture, and he sought to build the church on biblical principles.<sup>25</sup> He rejected

---

Kregel, 1972), and Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*.

<sup>21</sup>This is also the title of an excellent biography on Keach. See Austin Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 2nd rev. ed. (Dundas, ON: Joshua, 2015).

<sup>22</sup>For an overview of the difficulties Keach faced, see Crosby, *The History of the English Baptists*, 2:185–209. For information on his wife's support during persecution, see Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 61–81.

<sup>23</sup>The basic details of his early life and ministry are taken from Michael A. G. Haykin, *Kiffin, Knollys, and Keach: Rediscovering Our English Baptist Heritage* (Leeds, England: Reformation Today Trust, 1996), 84–87.

<sup>24</sup>Tom Nettles, *The Baptists*, vol. 1 (Fearn, Scotland: Christian Focus, 2006), 165. Nettles relied on William Cathcart's entry in *The Baptist Encyclopedia*. See William Cathcart, *The Baptist Encyclopedia* (Philadelphia: Everts, 1881), s.v. Keach, Benjamin.

<sup>25</sup>For a discussion of Keach's view of Scripture, see L. Russ Bush and Tom J. Nettles, *Baptists and*

infant baptism, emphasized regenerate church membership, exercised church discipline, introduced congregational hymn-singing into Baptist churches, and preached God's Word.<sup>26</sup> His theology influenced future Baptist theologians, his view of congregational hymn-singing shaped worship in future Baptist churches, and his preaching served as a model for future Baptist pastors. Haykin rightly calls him "one of the most significant Calvinistic Baptist divines of the seventeenth century."<sup>27</sup>

### **An Allegorical, Doctrinal, and Canonical Interpretive Approach**

During his long and fruitful ministry at the Baptist Church in Horseleydown, London, Keach spent nearly twelve years preaching through the parables in the gospels.<sup>28</sup> The sermons were eventually published as *Gospel Mysteries Unveil'd*. The book begins, not with Keach's expositions, but with an explanation of his perceived need for the book and a defense of his approach to interpreting the parables. Keach noted the central role of parables in the teaching ministry of Jesus and lamented, "No one author (as I can learn) hath in one or more volumes written upon them all, if the greatest part, nor any exposition as I can meet with of many of them."<sup>29</sup> This void prompted Keach to undertake the project which eventually became known as *Exposition of the Parables*.

After explaining the need for his work, Keach laid out his approach to interpreting the parables. Keach advocated for drawing propositions from the details of the parables. He chided those "who insinuate as if no propositions nor answerable applications ought to be made, but from the general scope of the parable."<sup>30</sup> He responded, "Now in this I am not of their opinion, for some things that may (perhaps) not so clearly appear to lie in the direct scope, may contain in them much instruction, and profitable truths may be raised therefrom, and improved."<sup>31</sup> Keach rejected a general approach to interpreting parables, insisting the details of the parable often contained deep spiritual truths. Given Keach's tendency to assign spiritual significance to the particular details of the parables, his approach can rightly be labeled "allegorical."

Keach supported his approach by pointing to the example of Jesus. In the parable of the sower, as well as the parable of the wheat and the tares, Jesus "opens every particular part, and applies it."<sup>32</sup> In other words, Jesus did not simply discuss the general scope of

---

*the Bible*, rev. ed. (Nashville, TN: B & H Academic, 1999), 75–81.

<sup>26</sup>Nettles, *The Baptists*, vol. 1, 185–88. Walker also has a good section on Keach's preaching ministry. See Walker, *The Excellent Benjamin Keach*, 249–77.

<sup>27</sup>Haykin, *Kiffin, Knollys, and Keach*, 97.

<sup>28</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, v, xiv.

<sup>29</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

<sup>30</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

<sup>31</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

<sup>32</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

the parables but pointed out the significance of each of the details.<sup>33</sup> Keach concluded, "Now can any direction given by learned men be so safe a rule to follow in expounding the parables, as that rule our Saviour hath left in the way taken by himself."<sup>34</sup> The expected answer is no; one cannot improve on the interpretive method of Jesus. Therefore, Jesus's interpretive method became the foundation for Keach's interpretive method.

Keach's argument should not be ignored or brushed aside. Jesus seemed to explain his parables in an allegorical fashion, finding significance in the details of the parable. Interpreters should be hesitant to reject an approach employed by Jesus to make sense of the parables. Indeed, to do so "seems to cast a kind of contempt upon the ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ, as well as it clearly contradicts his own exposition of those parables He Himself explained."<sup>35</sup> To be fair, Keach acknowledged not every detail of the parables was spiritually significant. He quipped, "Yet all authors agree, that parables run not always upon all four."<sup>36</sup> Some details are "brought in or mentioned for illustration sake" and "cannot be spiritually applied parallelwise."<sup>37</sup> Nevertheless, Keach was much more likely than not to interpret the details allegorically.

Keach also insisted the parables were intended to communicate doctrinal truth rather than "practical duties."<sup>38</sup> He believed the "main scope of our Lord in most of his parables" was threefold: (1) "to open to us the great doctrine of the Gospel," (2) "to show us the necessity of faith in himself," and (3) "to instruct us into doctrinal truths."<sup>39</sup> Therefore, Keach often understood the details of the parables to be communicating doctrinal truths. Even a cursory reading of his expositions reveals their doctrinal depth, which means any discussion of Keach's interpretive method must recognize its emphasis on doctrine.

One question remains: how did Keach avoid assigning whatever meaning he wished to the details in the parables? What governed his allegorical approach? The short answer is Scripture. Keach realized his approach could be abused, but he was convinced the key

---

<sup>33</sup>See Jesus's explanations of the parable of the sower and the parable wheat and the tares in Matt 13:18–23, 36–43. The explanation of the parable of the wheat and the tares is especially insightful. Virtually every object in the parable represented something else. The one who sows good seed is the Son of Man (v. 37). The field is the world (v. 38). The good seed is the sons of the kingdom (v. 38). The weeds are the sons of the evil one (v. 38). The enemy is the devil (v. 39). The harvest is the end of the age (v. 39). The reapers are the angels (v. 39). Based on Jesus's explanation of his parables, we should be hesitant to reject allegorical interpretations of the parables outright.

<sup>34</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

<sup>35</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xii.

<sup>36</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

<sup>37</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

<sup>38</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

<sup>39</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xi.

to avoiding unhelpful interpretations was keeping “to the true analogy of faith.”<sup>40</sup> In his mind, the analogy of faith provided sufficient guardrails to keep interpreters from falling into the ditch of wild and unfounded allegorization. Keach often followed his own advice here, tracing images and figures found in parables through Scripture and arguing a proper understanding of the imagery required a thorough knowledge of the Bible. For this reason, his approach can rightly be identified as canonical.

In summary, Keach advocated for an allegorical, doctrinal, and canonical interpretive approach to the parables. Baptist historian H. Leon McBeth credited Keach with helping “popularize religious allegory as a literary style.”<sup>41</sup> The allegorical nature of Keach’s approach allowed him to draw points of connection between details contained in the parables and doctrinal truths contained in Scripture. These connections were confirmed by Scripture in its totality, preventing Keach from drawing unbiblical conclusions from the particulars in the parables. Keach’s approach influenced Baptists for many years, until another respected Baptist challenged his approach. His name was John Albert Broadus.

### **John Albert Broadus: The Sins of “The Fathers”<sup>42</sup>**

John Albert Broadus was a Southern Baptist pastor and professor who ministered in America during the mid-to-late nineteenth century. Like Keach, Broadus has been heralded as a key figure in Baptist life.<sup>43</sup> He is primarily remembered for his classic work on preaching, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, but Broadus was also an able New Testament scholar.<sup>44</sup> His commentary on the Gospel of Matthew was described as “probably the best commentary in English on that Gospel.”<sup>45</sup> In his commentary, Broadus revealed his approach to interpreting the parables and interacted with Keach. This section will provide a short summary of Broadus’s life and describe his approach to interpreting and applying the parables.

---

<sup>40</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, xii.

<sup>41</sup>H. Leon McBeth, *The Baptist Heritage: Four Centuries of Baptist Witness* (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1987), 117.

<sup>42</sup>Broadus embraced a grammatical-historical approach to interpretation and generally disapproved of spiritualization and allegorization. He accused Philo and the Alexandrian Jews of “widely and wildly” spiritualizing the text and concluded, “Most of the great Fathers . . . are grievously infected with this evil.” John A. Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1870), 46.

<sup>43</sup>A. H. Newman suggested Broadus was “perhaps the greatest man the Baptist have produced.” A. H. Newman, in “Progress,” vol. 3, no. 10, quoted in A. T. Robertson, *Life and Letters of John Albert Broadus* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1910), 10.

<sup>44</sup>John A. Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1870).

<sup>45</sup>J. H. Thayer, *Books and Their Uses*, quoted by Robertson, *Life and Letters of John A. Broadus*, 357.

### John Albert Broadus: A Man "Mighty in the Scriptures"

John Albert Broadus was born on January 24, 1827, in Culpeper County, Virginia, to Edmund Broadus and Nancy Simms Broadus.<sup>46</sup> Between his family and his school teachers, Broadus received a solid education.<sup>47</sup> After completing his secondary education and teaching classes to secure the necessary funds, Broadus matriculated at the University of Virginia in the fall of 1846. Broadus graduated from the University of Virginia with his master of arts in the summer of 1850, married his wife in the fall of 1850, and accepted a call to serve as pastor of the Charlottesville Baptist Church and as a professor at the University of Virginia in the fall of 1851.

By all accounts, Broadus was content serving the church and the university in Charlottesville in various capacities, but change was on the horizon. While serving as chaplain of the University of Virginia and pastor of Charlottesville Baptist Church, Broadus participated in Southern Baptist efforts to establish a seminary committed to training Southern Baptist ministers. In 1857, the theological education committee of the Southern Baptist Convention appointed Broadus to serve on the Committee on the Plan of Organization, which was chaired by James Petigru Boyce.<sup>48</sup> Broadus was primarily responsible for overseeing the curriculum of the seminary.<sup>49</sup> After developing plans for the organization of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, it was necessary to select faculty to teach at the seminary. Broadus was elected to serve as professor of New Testament interpretation and preaching. He initially declined the offer, but Boyce refused to give up on Broadus and asked him to reconsider his position. Broadus eventually changed his mind and joined the faculty of the fledgling seminary.

Broadus spent the remainder of his life training Southern Baptist ministers. While serving as Professor of New Testament interpretation and preaching at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Greenville, South Carolina, and Louisville, Kentucky, Broadus wrote numerous works, including his classic preaching text, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*; his comprehensive commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*; and his book on the history of preaching, *Lectures on the History of Preaching*.<sup>50</sup> He also served as the president of the seminary from

---

<sup>46</sup>Andrew Broaddus, *A History of the Broaddus Family, from the Time of the Settlement of the Progenitor of the Family in the United States down to the year 1888* (St. Louis, MO: Central Baptist, 1888), 112–13.

<sup>47</sup>Robertson concluded that Broadus had "real educational advantages in his childhood." Robertson, *Life and Letters of John A. Broadus*, 25.

<sup>48</sup>For a detailed summary of Boyce's role in promoting the establishment of a seminary, see John Albert Broadus, *Memoir of James Petigru Boyce* (New York: Armstrong, 1893), 111–54, and Thomas J. Nettles, *James Petigru Boyce: A Southern Baptist Statesman* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2009), 124–81.

<sup>49</sup>Gregory Wills, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary: 1859–2009* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 24–28.

<sup>50</sup>Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*; Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel*

1888 until his death in 1895. Broadus's impact on Southern Baptist life is hard to overstate. He was heavily involved in educational efforts among Southern Baptists, helping develop the first Southern Baptist seminary, and his work on preaching shaped future generations of preachers. W. O. Carver's statement rings true: "No Baptist of his generation surpassed Broadus in his influence among Southern Baptists."<sup>51</sup>

### A Grammatical-Historical, Generic Interpretive Approach

Broadus is generally remembered as a great preacher, and rightfully so.<sup>52</sup> Yet A. T. Robertson, the renowned Greek grammarian and son-in-law of Broadus, argued Broadus was just as formidable a New Testament scholar as he was a preacher.<sup>53</sup> His most thorough work in the field of New Testament studies was his *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*.<sup>54</sup> In the commentary, Broadus discussed parables and provided four principles for interpreting parables: (1) we must make sure of understanding the language of the parable itself, and its various allusions to physical phenomena or social usages, (2) we must ascertain what subject our Lord here designed to illustrate, (3) we must consider in what light the parable presents the subject, and (4) then it remains to determine how far the details may be understood as separately significant.<sup>55</sup> By applying these four principles, Broadus believed it was possible to accurately interpret parables.

Broadus's first step was to analyze the grammar and historical context. As a New Testament scholar, Broadus recognized the need to study the language of the text and the historical and cultural aspects of the parable. For this reason, Broadus's approach can be designated "grammatical-historical." After analyzing the grammar and context, Broadus encouraged interpreters to "ascertain" the subject. In other words, what is the

---

*of Matthew*; and John A. Broadus, *Lectures on the History of Preaching* (New York: Armstrong, 1891).

<sup>51</sup>W. O. Carver, quoted in William A. Mueller, *A History of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary: 1859–1959* (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1959), 61.

<sup>52</sup>Broadus was included in the series *20 Centuries of Great Preaching*. See Clyde E. Fant Jr. and William M. Pinson Jr., eds., *20 Centuries of Great Preaching* (Waco, TX: Word, 1971), 5:41–89. Vernon Stanfield noted, "During the last half of the nineteenth century in America, no Baptist preacher enjoyed greater popular fame than did John Albert Broadus. By his Seminary colleagues, by denominational leaders, by competent critics of preaching, and by appreciative congregations, he was ranked as one of the leading preachers of his time." See John A. Broadus, *Favorite Sermons of John A. Broadus*, ed. Vernon L. Stanfield (New York: Harper, 1959), 1.

<sup>53</sup>A. T. Robertson, "Broadus as Scholar and Preacher," in *The Minister and His Greek New Testament* (repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001), 133. He stated, "It is hard to tell in which he most excelled, New Testament Interpretation or Homiletics. He was first in both."

<sup>54</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. David Dockery asserted this commentary "best exemplifies his first-rate scholarship." David S. Dockery, "The Broadus-Robertson Tradition," in *Theologians of the Baptist Tradition*, ed. Timothy George and David S. Dockery (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2001), 104.

<sup>55</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 284.

general subject of the parable? To what does the parable refer? Many of Jesus's parables explain various aspects of God's kingdom. Other subjects include Christ's return, financial stewardship, prayer, and the response of religious leaders. The interpreter must identify the subject of the parable in order to understand the meaning of the parable.

Once the subject of the parable has been identified, the interpreter can move to the third step, discovering whether the subject is presented positively or negatively. Is Jesus portraying the subject in a positive light or a negative light? Several of Jesus's parables present the religious leaders in a negative light. Other parables, like the parable of the Good Samaritan, present surprising characters in a positive light. Interpreters must determine how Jesus is portraying the subject to rightly understand the parable. Both step two and step three focus on the general subject of the parable, not the details. For this reason, Broadus's approach can be referred to as "generic."

The fourth and final step in Broadus's approach was to figure out which details of the parable are significant. The placement of this step at the end of the interpretive process is telling. Only after analyzing the grammar and historical context of the parable, identifying the subject of the parable, and determining how the subject is being portrayed should the interpreter consider the specific details of the parable and what they signify. Broadus was convinced most errors in interpreting parables come from overemphasizing the details of the parables. In his work on preaching, Broadus warned against "the danger of pressing the figure too far, of fancying a spiritual sense in aspects or details of the figure which are not really within the scope of the inspired writer," adding that this error is "especially common . . . in the interpretation of our Lord's *Parables*."<sup>56</sup> He issued a similar warning in his commentary on Matthew, writing "The tendency has usually been towards the extreme of giving a separate spiritual meaning to every detail."<sup>57</sup> The biggest threat to the proper interpretation of parables, according to Broadus, was assigning meaning to every detail in a parable.

In spite of the danger, Broadus realized the necessity of considering the spiritual significance of the details. After all, Jesus "fully interpreted the parables of the Sower and the Tares, and, to some extent, that of the Net."<sup>58</sup> A few sentences later, Broadus added, "It should be remembered that our Lord has carried out his three interpretations in much detail, and we must not reduce the parable to a bare trunk, stripped of all its foliage."<sup>59</sup> Broadus could not reject assigning spiritual significance to individual details of the parables, since Jesus did this each time he provided an interpretation of a parable. Instead, Broadus insisted discernment was necessary to identify which elements of the

---

<sup>56</sup>Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, 48. Italics in the original.

<sup>57</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 284.

<sup>58</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 284.

<sup>59</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 284.

parables were significant and which elements were “the mere filling out of the story, the mere drapery of the image,” which needed to “be let alone.”<sup>60</sup>

In theory, Broadus was open to allegorical or spiritual interpretations of the details of the parable. Yet his preaching volume and his commentary demonstrate Broadus preferred a generic, “main idea” approach to interpreting the parables and was hesitant to assign spiritual meaning to the particular details of the parables. For instance, he referenced the parable of leaven in his preaching textbook and commented, “What sense is there in looking for some spiritual truth illustrated by the number *three*, or in saying that the *woman* represents the Church, when as a matter of course a woman and not a man would be introduced in a story as making up bread?”<sup>61</sup> Given his emphasis on the grammar and historical context of the parables and his reservations about assigning spiritual significance to individual details, his approach can rightly be designated a grammatical-historical, generic interpretive approach.

### **An Analysis of the Expositions of Keach and Broadus**

Keach and Broadus each approached the parables in their own unique way. Keach generally exhausted the individual elements of the parables and emphasized the doctrinal truths contained in each one. Broadus tended to focus on the grammar and historical setting of each parable and provide one general principle from it. As a result of these distinct interpretive emphases, Keach and Broadus produced very different expositions of Jesus’s parables. Given Keach’s exhaustive treatment of the parables in general, and Broadus’s thorough treatment of Jesus’s parables in Matthew, an examination of every parable is impossible. In this article, I will compare Keach and Broadus’s divergent approaches to the parables by examining their comments on three parables: the Parable of the Ten Virgins, the Parable of the Leaven, and the Parable of the Marriage Supper.<sup>62</sup>

#### **The Parable of the Ten Virgins**

Keach dedicated more time to the parable of the Ten Virgins than any other parable except for the parable of the Marriage Supper. He preached nine sermons from this parable alone. The allegorical element of Keach’s hermeneutic was on full display in these

---

<sup>60</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 284.

<sup>61</sup>Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, 49.

<sup>62</sup>The Parable of the Ten Virgins was selected because Broadus chided Keach for finding spiritual significance in the details of the parable (Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 501). The Parable of the Leaven was chosen because Broadus used it as an illustration of improper spiritualization in his textbook on preaching (Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, 49). The Parable of the Marriage Supper was selected due to Keach’s thorough treatment of it (Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 543–633).

expositions. The virgins represented members of the invisible church.<sup>63</sup> The bridegroom was Jesus.<sup>64</sup> The lamps signified an external profession of faith.<sup>65</sup> The vessel was the heart.<sup>66</sup> The oil was the Spirit of God.<sup>67</sup> The slumber of the virgins represented "a want of that due watchfulness which is required in all the disciples of Jesus Christ."<sup>68</sup> The shut door conveyed the wrath of God.<sup>69</sup> All of these individual elements represented a spiritual truth and contained doctrinal riches, but Keach's description of the Spirit of God was particularly rich. He argued the Spirit of God heals and softens, expels poison and Satan's temptation, revives, beautifies, and gives life.<sup>70</sup> Keach made sure to ground his views in Scripture. When defending his view that oil in the parable represented the Spirit of God, Keach cited Ps 14:7 and 1 John 2:27 in support.<sup>71</sup> When identifying sleep as a lack of due spiritual watchfulness, he cited Matt 26:41 and Prov 19:15. Although Keach preached nine sermons from the parable, he provided its main point in just two sentences: "1. To discover what a multitude of formal and foolish professors there would be in the church at the time of this his coming. 2. To stir up all Christians to holy watchfulness, lest they meet with a dismal disappointment when he comes."<sup>72</sup>

Unlike Keach, Broadus did not see much significance in the details of the parable of the Ten Virgins. He said, "To find some separate spiritual meaning in the lamps, the vessels, the oil, and the sellers of oil, etc., seems here worse than idle."<sup>73</sup> Rather than focus on the details, Broadus discussed Jewish wedding customs and the tenses of the Greek verbs.<sup>74</sup> Based on a general understanding of the parable, Broadus concluded the parable "teaches the same lesson as 24:37-42 and 43-51, that the only way to be ready when Jesus comes is to be ready always."<sup>75</sup> Interestingly, Broadus derived the same main idea from the parable as Keach, but their roads to that main idea were drastically different.

### The Parable of the Leaven

Given the brevity of the parable of the Leaven, Keach's exposition is relatively short. In his sermon, Keach interpreted the leaven as the word of God, the woman as Jesus Christ,

<sup>63</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 646.

<sup>64</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 649.

<sup>65</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 652-53.

<sup>66</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 663.

<sup>67</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 664.

<sup>68</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 670.

<sup>69</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 696.

<sup>70</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 664.

<sup>71</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 664.

<sup>72</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 644.

<sup>73</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 501.

<sup>74</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 498-500.

<sup>75</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 500.

and the whole loaf as the elect.<sup>76</sup> The bulk of Keach's exposition was doctrinal, focusing on the leaven as the word of God. Like leaven, Keach argued the word of God: (1) is diffusive, (2) spreads in degrees, (3) is of assimilating nature, (4) is of quickening and powerful nature, (5) is hid, specifically in the heart, (6) is of softening nature, (7) works secretly and invisibly, (8) will "set home upon the heart" of all the elect, and (9) answers a great design.<sup>77</sup> Keach grounded these ideas in Scripture, citing Heb 4:12, Ps 119:11, and 1 Cor 5:6, as well as numerous other texts. Keach concluded the parable of the Leaven revealed the power of the word of God, which must be received into the heart and which will "in the end . . . wonderfully spread and prevail throughout all the world."<sup>78</sup>

Broadus interpreted the parable of the Leaven in a much more grammatical-historical and generic fashion. He began by examining the individual words of the parable and their historical background. He identified "meal" as "what we now call 'flour.'"<sup>79</sup> He defined "three measures" as "rather more than our bushel" and noted the size of a measure "varied in different parts of Palestine."<sup>80</sup> He cited Josephus and Alfred Edersheim as historical experts in support of his views. Broadus was careful to avoid assigning spiritual significance to the details. He declared, "To find a special spiritual meaning in the number three, would seem to us ridiculous."<sup>81</sup> He felt the same way about the woman, writing, "So with the attempt to give separate significance to the woman, when it was a matter of course to speak of a woman, and not of a man, making up bread."<sup>82</sup> Looking to the details for spiritual significance was "ridiculous" to Broadus. He found meaning in the general message of the parable, writing, "The general meaning of this parable is the same as that of the preceding. A small bit of leaven, completely hidden from view in the great mass of dough, would finally leaven the whole; and so Christianity, with its small and obscure beginnings, would pervade the whole race of mankind."<sup>83</sup>

### The Parable of the Marriage Supper

Keach's most thorough treatment of a parable was his exposition of the parable of the Marriage Supper, which consisted of sixteen sermons from Matt 22:1-14.<sup>84</sup> Like the previous parables, Keach found spiritual significance in the details of the parable. The

<sup>76</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 251.

<sup>77</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 251-52.

<sup>78</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 250.

<sup>79</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 297.

<sup>80</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 297.

<sup>81</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 297.

<sup>82</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 297.

<sup>83</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 297.

<sup>84</sup>Keach also referenced Luke 14, but the bulk of the exposition focused on Matthew's telling of the parable. Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 543-634.

king was God.<sup>85</sup> The son was Jesus.<sup>86</sup> The marriage represented the soul's union with Jesus Christ.<sup>87</sup> The supper signified spiritual blessings.<sup>88</sup> The first guests who were invited were the Jews.<sup>89</sup> The servants were the prophets.<sup>90</sup> The other servants were the apostles.<sup>91</sup> The oxen were sacrifices under the law, as well as Christ and the gospel.<sup>92</sup> The wedding garment represented Jesus Christ and his righteousness.<sup>93</sup> Every detail was important to Keach. He believed they contained deep, doctrinal truths. From the specific details of the parable, Keach preached about justification, sanctification, the wrath of God, the depravity of man, and a host of other doctrines. Again, Keach attempted to ground these truths in the canon of Scripture rather than his imagination. When arguing the wedding garment referred to Christ and his righteousness, Keach referenced his exposition of the parable of the Prodigal Son as well as Ezek 16:14 and Rom 13:14 to defend his position.<sup>94</sup> Based on his study of the text, Keach concluded the parable was intended to do three things: (1) "to convince the Jews of God's great love unto them," (2) "to manifest his infinite love and goodness unto the Gentiles also," and (3) to show "that many who have the outward ministration of the Gospel shall perish eternally."<sup>95</sup>

Broadus's exposition of the parable was markedly differed than Keach's exposition. Broadus focused on the grammar of the text, defining Greek words like *gamos* and discussing the historical background of wedding garments.<sup>96</sup> Unlike Keach, he did not assign spiritual significance to the wedding garment. He urged interpreters not to "distract attention by discussing the question whether wedding garments were furnished."<sup>97</sup> To be fair, Broadus attached spiritual significance to the king's son, identifying him as the Messiah, but this was an anomaly. Broadus was content to analyze the key words and historical background in order to discern the general idea of the parable: the Jews will be punished for rejecting the Messiah, the Gentiles will be invited to participate in the God's kingdom, and those who profess faith in Christ "must become righteous in character and life or they cannot enjoy

---

<sup>85</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 544.

<sup>86</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 544.

<sup>87</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 544.

<sup>88</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 544.

<sup>89</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 544.

<sup>90</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 544.

<sup>91</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 544.

<sup>92</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 545.

<sup>93</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 547

<sup>94</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables* 630–31. His exposition of the parable of the Prodigal Son included other passages supporting a spiritual understanding of the wedding garment, like Job 30:18 and Isa 61:10.

<sup>95</sup>Keach, *Exposition of the Parables*, 543.

<sup>96</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 446, 448–49.

<sup>97</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 449.

its benefits.”<sup>98</sup> Like the other parables, Broadus and Keach arrived at similar conclusions, but the road they took to get there was quite different.

### Lessons for Contemporary Preachers

In this paper, I have attempted to highlight the distinctive interpretive approaches of Benjamin Keach and John Broadus. Keach attached spiritual significance to the individual elements of the parables, whereas Broadus tended to minimize the importance of the details. Keach discovered deep doctrinal truths in the parables, whereas Broadus looked for the general meaning of the parable. In spite of their unique methodologies and emphases, however, Keach and Broadus arrived at similar conclusions regarding the primary meaning of the parables, which indicates both men have something to teach us. So what can preachers learn from Keach and Broadus? What is the takeaway for contemporary preachers? I will conclude with six lessons preachers today can learn from these two homiletical giants.

#### 1. Don't Reject Allegorical Interpretation

Preachers should not reject an allegorical interpretive approach to the parables. This advice goes against the grain of much contemporary scholarship. Many recent works on biblical interpretation warn against allegorical interpretation.<sup>99</sup> Homileticians have followed in their footsteps. Steven Smith described allegorical interpretation as a “strained hermeneutic,” although he could not deny the historical nature of the approach and some of the classic works it produced.<sup>100</sup> Yet, the two inspired interpretations of parables provided by Jesus are allegorical. To reject allegorical interpretation altogether is to reject the interpretive method of Jesus! Therefore, contemporary preachers would be wise to follow Keach and interpret the parables allegorically. Some may fear this approach will inevitably lead to abuse, but spiritual discernment and canonical theology can help prevent preachers from abusing allegorical interpretation.

#### 2. Identify the Main Point of the Parable

Each parable has one main point, and preachers should seek to communicate it. Craig Blomberg has argued to the contrary, suggesting most parables contain three primary

---

<sup>98</sup>Broadus, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 448–49.

<sup>99</sup>As Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard put it, “Most modern interpreters feel ambivalence, if not antipathy, toward this approach.” William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, rev. ed. (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2004), 40.

<sup>100</sup>Steven W. Smith, *Recapturing the Voice of God: Shaping Sermons Like Scripture* (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2015), 110. It should be noted that Smith did not reject allegorical interpretation altogether. He stated that parables do not always function allegorically, but often the characters of the parables can be interpreted allegorically, as they “have one to one correlation with someone else or some other truth” (109).

characters and communicate three points.<sup>101</sup> Snodgrass argued parables can communicate one or many main points.<sup>102</sup> While Blomberg and Snodgrass are right in suggesting most parables have multiple characters and communicate various truths, their argument does not preclude parables having one dominant theme or idea. As Smith argued, "Even in parables with multiple ideas, they are not all equal. There is a dominant idea."<sup>103</sup> Like Broadus, preachers should identify this dominant idea and seek to emphasize it in their sermon. They may preach other ideas or points within the sermon, but they should stress the main idea of the parable while preaching.

### 3. Pay Attention to the Details

When preaching from the parables, pay attention to the details. Who are the main characters? Where does the event occur? What objects are described? These details matter and affect how the parable should be understood. Snodgrass did not place much emphasis on the details of the parables, saying parables "are not one-for-one analogies."<sup>104</sup> Broadus did not emphasize the details, either. Yet Jesus assigned spiritual significance to the details of the parable of the sower, as well as the parable of the wheat and the tares, which demonstrates that – at the least – some of the details are significant and affect how we understand the parables. Preachers should not be afraid to embrace one-for-one correspondence in the parables. Like Blomberg and Smith argued, the characters of the parable are important and should be analyzed to determine what or who they signify.<sup>105</sup> As Keach demonstrated, the objects of the parables represent spiritual realities and should be considered in the interpretive task. Preachers must pay attention to the details.

### 4. Use Discernment

While preachers must attend to the details of the parables, they must also exercise discernment when attempting to assign spiritual significance to individual characters or elements within the parables. As Snodgrass observed, "The key is knowing when to stop interpreting."<sup>106</sup> Based on his hermeneutical work, Broadus was overly cautious in this regard, but he realized the importance of details and the need for discernment when assigning spiritual significance to them.<sup>107</sup> Preachers should follow Broadus's advice and use

---

<sup>101</sup>Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 171–72.

<sup>102</sup>Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 28.

<sup>103</sup>Smith, *Recapturing the Voice of God*, 108.

<sup>104</sup>Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 27.

<sup>105</sup>Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 171–72, and Smith, *Recapturing the Voice of God*, 109.

<sup>106</sup>Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 28.

<sup>107</sup>He encouraged preachers to "inquire how far we may fairly regard the several details of the story as separately significant" and to "avoid extremes," since parables are illustrations which are "founded on some resemblance or analogy which is at best only partial." Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, 49.

discernment when trying to determine the spiritual significance of the individual elements of the parables.

### **5. Look to the Entire Canon for Guidance**

The canon in its entirety should shape the way preachers understand the individual elements of parables. If an image or object is used to communicate spiritual truth consistently throughout Scripture, the image or object likely conveys the same spiritual truth in the parable. The “robe” imagery in the parable of the Prodigal Son, for example, likely represents the imputed righteousness of Christ. While opponents of allegorical interpretation may view this as arbitrary, the repeated use of the image in Scripture lends credibility to the association.<sup>108</sup> Keach exemplified this approach, tracing images through Scripture and assigning spiritual significance to the details based on the results. Preachers who ground their one-for-one correspondence in Scripture as a whole are less likely to make arbitrary or unbiblical connections when interpreting the parables.

### **6. Preach Sound Doctrine**

The parables contain rich doctrine. They touch on the nature of the kingdom of God, character of God, work of Christ, sinfulness of man, end of the age, and a host of other theological truths, and preachers should not shy away from declaring these truths. As John Broadus wrote, “Doctrine, i.e., teaching, is the preacher’s chief business. . . . The facts and truths which belong to the Scripture account of Sin, Providence and Redemption, form the staple of all Scripture preaching.”<sup>109</sup> Keach’s expositions of the parables are gold mines of theological treasure and provide a model of doctrinal preaching for contemporary preachers. Preachers should preach the great doctrines of Scripture from the parables, following Broadus’s advice and Keach’s example.

---

<sup>108</sup>Isaiah 61:10 uses clothing imagery to describe salvation, specifically referencing “the robe of righteousness” with which God covers the believer. Zechariah 3:4 also uses clothing imagery to describe removing sin and receiving purity. The New Testament authors use this imagery as well. See Rom 13:14 and Eph 4:17–24 for examples.

<sup>109</sup>Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, 68.

***Against God and Nature: The Doctrine of Sin.* By Thomas H. McCall. Foundations of Evangelical Theology. Edited by John S. Feinberg. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2019. 442 pages. Hardcover, \$40.00.**

Thomas H. McCall (PhD, Calvin Theological Seminary) is professor of biblical and systematic theology and director for the Carl F. H. Henry Center for Theological Understanding at Trinity Evangelical Divinity Seminary in Deerfield, Illinois. Among his publications, he has authored or edited several volumes on the doctrine of the Trinity and an introduction to analytic theology. The volume under consideration is a new release in the Crossway series titled Foundations of Evangelical Theology.

The book is well organized, featuring a series introduction, preface, explanation of abbreviations, eight chapters, an appendix, and Scripture and general indexes. In chapter 1, McCall introduces the study by highlighting the significance of the topic and noting the unity among Christian theologians on the broad view that general revelation informs humans that something is wrong and that only the special revelation of Jesus Christ clarifies the problem and solution. Also, the author describes his theological method. McCall regards Scripture as the norming norm, uses a canonical-theological interpretation of Scripture, interacts with the broad Christian tradition, and regards philosophy as serving a minor, assisting role in formulating a doctrine of sin.

Chapter 2 provides the biblical-theological treatment and, at eighty pages, is the longest chapter. After briefly surveying five OT and six NT terms for sin, McCall provides a “biblical theological overview” of the canon in eight sections, devoting four sections to the OT and four to the NT. Each section narrates the biblical storyline, focusing on the presence and impact of or solution to sin. For example, “Sin in the Beginnings” commences at the creation account and moves through the shattered shalom in the garden to human responsibility, further damage to creation and creatures, as well as the *protoevangelium* and covenant promises to one man, Abraham, and extending to his family—which culminates in the cross and reverses the damage initiated by the first man. Also, this first section tells the story of sin in the other four books of the Pentateuch. The next three sections address sin in the books of OT history, wisdom, and prophetic literature. McCall interacts throughout this section with Mark Boda’s *A Severe Mercy* and also notes the work of other OT scholars.<sup>1</sup> McCall addresses sin in the NT in four sections: the Gospels and Acts, Paul’s writings, Hebrews and the General Epistles, and John’s writings. McCall’s presentation is guided by the biblical text and seasoned with helpful observations from a cast of contemporary NT scholars, including George Ladd, Tom Schreiner, Christopher Wright, N. T. Wright, and Richard Bauckham. The chapter ends with a brief summary noting four themes for sin in Scripture, all of which are rooted in the concept of sin as the breaking of relationship with God (111).

---

<sup>1</sup>Mark Boda, *A Severe Mercy: Sin and Its Remedy in the Old Testament* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007).

Chapter 3 addresses the topic “The Origin of Sin.” McCall describes the fall in the garden as doubting God’s goodness and rejecting God and his ways, resulting in broken relationships with God, each other, and creation. The author then raises the argument of F. D. E. Schleiermacher that human sin was caused by God to necessitate redemption. McCall marshalls arguments from medieval theologians such as Bonaventure and Aquinas as well as Reformed author G. C. Berkouwer to argue that God is neither the author nor the cause of human sin. The proper approach, which McCall repeatedly states in the study, is to recognize that human sin was a possibility but not a necessity in God’s good creation (135).<sup>2</sup> Stated concisely, “Sin is a defect that has come about by the abuse of our God-given freedom of will” (136). McCall’s account of the fall of Satan and some of the angels is similar; they were good creations of God who misused their freedom of the will.

In chapter 4, McCall provides a clear and comprehensive presentation and analysis of the historic Christian theories of original sin. He details the following six major options and representatives: symbolic and existential interpretations (F. R. Tennant); corruption-only doctrines (Christian theology before Augustine, the Orthodox Church, Zwingli, Richard Swinburne, Stan Grenz); corruption and guilt: federalism (Turretin); corruption and guilt: realism (Augustine, Edwards); corruption and guilt: mediate views (Anselm, Calvin, Henri Blocher); and conditional imputation of guilt (Millard Erickson). As a result of the precision and documentation among these views, this 22-page section is worth the price of the entire book. McCall presents a brief analysis of the most important NT text on original sin, Rom 5:12–21. After ruling out the Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian interpretations, as well as those that fail to affirm Adam and Eve as historical persons, the author explains how each of the other views can be defended based on how one interprets the phrases *eph hō* (“because”) and *pantes hēmarton* (“all sinned”) in v. 12. He concludes the section by agreeing with Douglas Moo that Paul establishes human solidarity with Adam without explaining the nature of the union. Next, McCall revisits the theories of original sin by measuring them against metaphysical and moral questions. He regards Edwards’s realism to be fatally flawed due to occasionalism but considers a modified realism to be possible when interpreted in light of fission theory. He finds the mediate views to be possibilities for Molinists, and he regards federalism to be defensible from an exegetical view alone but problematic morally due to the concept of alien guilt. He concludes by citing Oliver Crisp’s case for the orthodoxy of the corruption-only views, which affirm that all humans after the first couple (except Christ) inherit a corruption of nature but not the guilt of Adam.

Chapter 5 is a central chapter of the book because the author attempts to define the nature of sin. McCall’s thesis is that “sin should be understood as being contrary to nature, contrary to reason, and ultimately, contrary to God” (207). He explains that being sinful is a common but not essential human property, enabling one to affirm coherently that Jesus was fully human yet without sin. Also, McCall raises concerns about the two-

---

<sup>2</sup>As another example, McCall begins his biblical theology overview of the Pentateuch, “The creation account itself hints at the possibility (though not the necessity) of sin (Gen. 2:16–17)” (p. 40).

natured Christian view, explores the term sinful nature, and concludes that human nature as exemplified by people has been corrupted—rather than speaking of a thing called the sinful nature. He defines sin as a “privation of the good” and “contrary to reason rightly ordered” (232, 235). In this chapter, McCall makes distinctions such as intentional and unintentional sins, moral and venial sins, and individual and systemic sins.

In chapter 6, McCall addresses the results of sin. He traces the historical debates between Augustine and the Pelagians, noting the statements from Augustine’s writings that individuals are saved through baptism, sin proceeds from the free misuse of the human will, and God’s grace is prevenient. Also, McCall traces the Pelagian and “Semi-Pelagian” debate (quotation marks his) through the centuries and concludes the issue was not about the freedom of the will or the transmission of guilt but whether humans initiate their own salvation. Also in the chapter, McCall assumes spiritual death proceeds from the fall then considers possible answers to whether the physical death of humans and animals was a direct result of the fall, a matter which has implications for one’s view of when humans appeared and whether God’s design for creation included physical death, including animal predation. Also, the chapter includes a robust discussion of God’s wrath as “the contingent expression of the holy love that is shared between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit” (334).<sup>3</sup>

In chapter 7, McCall addresses divine providence and human sin. After stating the basic affirmations of human responsibility for sin, divine goodness, and divine sovereignty, McCall summarizes and exposes the inadequacies of theological determinism, occasionalism, deism, and process theology. He then advocates for non-determinist interpretations of the basic affirmations which incorporate Molinist or Thomist views of conservation, concurrence, and governance. The chapter concludes with sections on sin and prevenient, justifying, regenerating, and sanctifying grace. The last section includes an interesting case for interpreting Rom 7 (following Gordon Fee) not as a Christian who struggles with sin but a non-Christian’s life described by a Christian. Also, the last section concludes with implications for believers on practical holiness and sanctification from a biblical-historical perspective.

Chapter 8, at less than four pages, seems out of place next to the other substantive and comprehensive chapters. It neither introduces new ideas nor summarizes the major concepts in the book. Authors must bring their readers to the end of their journey in a book, and the concluding chapter attempted to achieve that goal.

The placement of the final essay as an appendix rather than a main chapter was a wise decision by the author or editor because the essay relates to the body of McCall’s argument

---

<sup>3</sup>The ideas that God’s wrath is an expression of God’s love and that his wrath is a contingent expression of God’s love, an essential attribute, are ideas that are stated repeatedly in the study (as examples, see 71, 124, 325–26, and 331–38).

but was a tangential discussion. In “The Original Sinners,” McCall attempts to demonstrate how the historical claim that Adam and Eve were genuine persons can be compatible with recent studies in contemporary genetics.

The study is not without its weaknesses, although none of them are weighty issues or would distract readers. One wonders if the author sometimes overused quotations of sources. While direct quotations serve to characterize the view of another person accurately or to cite a well-stated point, block quotes were used frequently, and some of the quotations are extensive. The most extensive quotation occurs when Is 1:2–31 is quoted on pages 61–64. Perhaps the author could have summarized the prophet’s message or quoted only some sections of the message, rather than quoting the entire biblical text. Also, the author’s sections on prevenient grace might have been strengthened by interaction with Brian Shelton’s *Prevenient Grace*, one of the only full-length monographs on the topic.<sup>4</sup> Even with those minor matters, McCall’s facility with the significant primary and secondary resources in the field as well as his balanced approach of biblical, historical, and analytical analysis of the major issues resulted in a volume that might be the most important scholarship on the doctrine of sin published in this century.

- Adam Harwood, *New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana*

**American History. 2 vols. By Thomas S. Kidd. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2019. 338 and 358 pages. Paperback, \$59.99 each.**

What is the goal of historians exercising their craft? Specifically, what is the unique goal of an American Christian composing a “national autobiography” (1:2)? Thomas S. Kidd (PhD, University of Notre Dame) serves as Distinguished Professor of History at Baylor University and is a prodigious publisher of volumes that are both American and Christian. Some of his many well-received volumes include *Benjamin Franklin: The Religious Life of a Founding Father* (Yale, 2017), *Baptists in America: A History* (Oxford, 2015) with Barry Hankins, and *The Great Awakening: The Roots of Evangelical Christianity in Colonial America* (Yale, 2009). Thus, a national autobiography on America with a volitional focus on the historical influence of Christianity appears to be conspicuously in Kidd’s wheelhouse.

Historiography is not for the faint of heart. Kidd writes amid the vortex between purely academic American history textbooks with their largely secular approach and the “Christian nation” approach of many American history books and textbooks written by Christians that often tend toward the excesses of hagiography and a procrustean approach to theological and practical heterodoxy in the history of America. He writes, “Paradoxically, the United States has historically been secular and religious at the same time” (1:60). Kidd

---

<sup>4</sup>See my review of Brian Shelton, *Prevenient Grace: God’s Provision for Fallen Humanity* (Anderson, IN: Warner, 2014) in *Journal for Baptist Theology & Ministry* 13, no. 2 (Fall 2016): 174–76.

navigates these turbulent waters with precision. Kidd does not write *American History* as a neutral observer. The volumes are not biography; they are autobiography—Kidd writes as an American and an American Christian.

Kidd's volume 1 of *American History* focuses on the time period from 1492–1877, while volume 2 restricts its purview to the years of 1877–2019. These date ranges allow Kidd to chart the development of what would become America from the voyage of Columbus in 1492, though he briefly surveys the available information on pre-1492 “America,” to the end of Reconstruction. Volume 2 picks up the story of the relaunch of America following the devastating Civil War through western expansion, increasing patterns of immigration, and urbanization. Volume 2 brings the reader up to the contemporary moment as Kidd describes Trump's use of Twitter and the investigation into Russian collusion in the 2016 presidential election. As Kidd takes his readers through recent decades, he is especially astute to note political controversies from President Clinton's reported affairs to President George W. Bush's “mission accomplished” speech to the Benghazi controversy to the video showing pre-candidate Donald Trump seeming to brag about sexual harassment. While volume 1 reads more like history, volume 2 feels like a Sunday drive through recent pop culture. This should remind readers old enough to remember some of the events that Kidd describes that history is being laid down even as we learn about history. Today's headlines may be tomorrow's history.

One of Kidd's greatest strengths in these volumes is also a potential shortcoming. He is well aware of the difficulty of assessing historical events and especially recent events. Kidd writes, “As we approach the contemporary American era, it becomes more difficult for historians to assign relative significance to recent events” (2:297). Kidd writes during the era of President Donald Trump for American Christians alive during the era of Trump and this comes through at various points (e.g., Charles Lindberg's organization was titled the “America First Committee”—a phrase that was invoked during the inauguration of Trump in 2016 [2:168]). At numerous points, Kidd employs phrases like “a trend that still endures today” (2:117). Thus, Kidd's *American History* are volumes meant to serve contemporary citizens and students of history during this contemporary moment, while at the same time Kidd would readily acknowledge that as time progresses there will be the need for a second edition and for subsequent volumes of and for American history.

Kidd weaves his tapestry of American history with several purposefully-chosen threads. Though he only enumerates three of these, this reviewer believes there are at least four. The first of these seems to be the utter “typicality” of the regular people from American history. Kidd does not desire to write a “great man/woman” runway show of historical figures and call it history. He allows the historical spotlight to shine on these recognized great figures (though the “great figures” are often revealed to be more flawed and the villains more complicated than their popular perceptions), but reminds the reader throughout that history is much more than the sum total of the big boys/girls of history. History often hinges

on people whose names will never achieve popular recognition. Jefferson, FDR, MLK, and Reagan must be and are described, but Kidd's "typicality" shines in both volumes. For instance, this is seen as Kidd describes the D-Day invasion and quotes from a soldier who, even in his monumental historical contribution, does not get his name elucidated.

The second of these threads is religion. Kidd makes no apologies for writing as an Evangelical Baptist who identifies with "champions of revival and religious liberty in the eighteenth century" (1:1). He also seemingly writes primarily *for* Evangelical Christians. Kidd will focus on everything from the Conservative Resurgence in the Southern Baptist Convention (2:284–285) to the Deism of the "Founding Fathers" (1:60–61) to the five points of early-twentieth century Christian Fundamentalism (2:49). The uniqueness of Kidd is that he walks in both the historical and theological words and speaks the lingo and idiosyncrasies of both. Kidd acknowledges in agreement with postmodernism that he isn't writing "neutral" history. He clearly says, "one's faith makes a direct difference in how one assesses history" (1:3). However, in radical contradistinction with contemporary postmodernism the reader of *American History* is left with the distinct impression of the theistic purposefulness of history as Kidd writes the story of America.

The third thread for Kidd's historical tapestry is racial and ethnic conflict. America's original sin of slavery and the ensuing turmoil over civil rights in American society, rightfully occupies a recurring placeholder in many chapters across these two volumes. Kidd addresses directly the dark history of racial superiority in American history and showcases its sinful nature. For instance, he writes, "Many African American Baptists continued to believe slavery was wrong, of course" (1:211). Kidd systematically describes the historical development of American racial slavery. Interestingly, he writes, "In rare cases blacks who gained their freedom in the seventeenth century even went on to own slaves themselves. White's rigid association of 'black' with 'slave' had not yet arrived" (1:28). Kidd helpfully traces the struggle for African-American civil rights through many of the movement's major figures (W.E.B. Dubois, Marcus Garvey, Martin Luther King Jr., and Barack Obama).

The final thread utilized by Kidd is the state of American culture. This may be one of the more interesting parts of the books as he takes care to note "issues such as virtue, traditional moral norms, mass media, and entertainment" (2). In many of these instances, he attempts to let the history preach itself, but sometimes he ventures into homiletical application as he applies history to the reader (e.g., James Dukes's desire for the Chinese people to average a cigarette a day to earn him millions [1:62] *vis à vis* Kidd's identified lacuna of meaning for life and availability of salvation amid rampant consumption and consumerism (2:213–16)). Furthermore, as Kidd discusses Gilded Age immigration policy and Margaret Sanger (2:30), the reader detected implicit criticisms of nativist sentiment (1:225) as well as implied critiques of racial superiority (2:232), eugenics (2:30), and abortion (2:267).

Writing history is difficult. Kidd's two volumes of *American History* are not perfect. To this reviewer, the largest shortcoming is in the area of formatting, especially in relation to provided quotes. Very few times across these hundreds of pages are footnotes provided detailing the precise location for the quoted material. When a footnote is provided, the material is often linked to a YouTube video (e.g., "Iron Curtain speech" [2:191] or an "I Love Lucy" episode [2:209]). There are many times across Kidd's *American History* that the precise location for a quotation is both badly needed and would prove satisfying to the itch of curiosity. For instance, Kidd provides a revolting quotation from Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* during his discussion on Progressivism, yet the reader is left to find the quotation's location and accompany context on their own (2:73). Hopefully, subsequent revisions will provide this information. Furthermore, the issue of formatting/footnotes/referencing brings up a more foundational point. While Kidd decries the impact of consumerism, yet the question remains: to whom are these volumes primarily intended? Are they intended for homeschoolers, high school students, or college students? Are they intended for pastors or historians? Who is going to buy them and keep his unique contributions from *American History* in circulation? After reading the two volumes, the intended audience/market does not seem altogether clear.

Another difficult aspect of writing large-scale history is deciding chapter divisions based on themes, events, people, or movements. Some portions of history in America lend themselves quite well to chapter divisions (e.g., World War I, The Roaring Twenties, or World War II). However, large portions of history do not lend themselves to clear thematic division which facilitates awkward chronological movement. Readers of *American History* will find at times themselves unstuck in time as, for instance, they contemplate the impact of the iPhone upon American society before they are formally introduced to the presidency of Ronald Regan (2:277–80). The latter part of the twentieth century in America is notoriously difficult to assign clean and clear chapter divisions. For instance, is the Civil Rights era completely compartmentalized from the Cold War? Which one comes first? Kidd is open to criticism on his chapter divisions, but honesty necessitates the point that this reviewer is not certain of a *better* time period division than what Kidd proposed in *American History*. Possibly, Kidd could have better described the reasoning behind his chapter divisions.

What is the goal of an American Christian composing a "national autobiography?" (1:2)? Kidd's goal is to instruct his contemporaries with dual citizenship (Phil 3:10) in both the kingdom of God and in the nation known as the United States of America about their past, with the knowledge of past "mistakes and sins," their present, as they receive inspiration from considering the stories "of historical heroes," and about their future, as they seek to avoid the mistakes of the past while following their Savior and pursuing a more perfect Union in the contemporary moment. Kidd doesn't answer every question that arises in the academic discipline of American history—but he doesn't attempt to do so. It seems that the job of the historian is not to answer every question from history; rather, the job of the historian is to teach their readers about the right questions that need

to be answered amid the pursuit of a right understanding of history. This reader has more questions for and from history as a result of reading *American History*. For instance, if Dick Cheney was a “neoconservative” in 2002 for wanting to invade Iraq (2:327), then what was he when he didn’t want to topple Saddam in the early 1990s (2:306)? Did he change? Did the situation change? Did the definitions of ideological positions change? Kidd makes a massive contribution towards his end. Thomas Kidd’s two volumes of *American History* should be read, discussed, and applied.

- Patrick G. Willis, Rosefield Baptist Church, Grayson, Louisiana, and Jena High School, Jena, Louisiana

***The Battle for the Keys: Revelation 1:18 and Christ’s Descent into the Underworld.* By Justin W. Bass. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014. 117 pages. Paperback, \$21.00.**

Justin W. Bass (PhD, Dallas Theological Seminary) serves as lead pastor of 1042 Church in Frisco, Texas, as well as an adjunct professor at Dallas Christian College and Dallas Theological Seminary. In *The Battle for the Keys: Revelation 1:18 and Christ’s Descent into the Underworld*, Bass seeks to investigate a subject debated heavily throughout the centuries. Bass seemingly reflects his own perspective by employing a quote from Augustine in the opening line of the book. Augustine writes, “Who, therefore, but an infidel will deny that Christ was in hell?” (1). While Bass, along with others throughout the centuries, unapologetically affirm Christ’s descent into hell, the nature of the work is to overview what is meant by “hell,” what Jesus did during this descent, and how Rev 1:18 affirms the descent of Jesus into hell following his death and prior to his resurrection.

Chapter 1 begins with a survey from the early church through the Reformation, noting the consensus that most who wrote on the topic of Christ’s death and resurrection unanimously concluded that Christ descended into hell following his death. According to Bass, “there were widely diverse beliefs on what Christ accomplished at his descent, but *that Christ descended in his soul to the underworld* there was ‘universal consent’” (2, emphasis his). Given that the early church was writing during the time John received his revelation, recorded within the book of Revelation, Bass concludes that Rev 1:18 must be understood in light of Christ’s *descensus*.

In Chapter 2, Bass overviews death and Hades within the Greco-Roman world, the Old Testament, Second Temple Jewish Literature, and the New Testament. During these periods, it was believed that all of humanity descended into Sheol/Hades following earthly death. Bass’s logic is as follows: if humanity descends into the depths of Sheol/Hades at death, then Christ in his incarnation—being fully human—then too “must descend into Hades according to the ‘law of the dead’” (116). Ultimately, through Christ, death and Hades are conquered.

Chapter 3 highlights the varying sources promoting the possession of the “keys” to the underworld. Not isolated to the Christian tradition, the idea of possessing keys is found in numerous other sources. However, while noting other sources in which the thought is promoted, Bass focuses upon six New Testament passages (Matt 16:19; Luke 11:52; Rev 1:18; 3:7; 9:1; 20:1). Bass supplements the primary six passages by overviewing the works of Kroll (1932), Bieder (1949), and MacCulloch (1930), as well as two other prominent *descensus* passages (Eph 4:8-11; 1 Pet 3:18-22).

Within chapters 4 and 5, Bass begins his investigation into the nature of death, Hades, Paradise, Abraham’s Bosom, Abyss, Tartarus, Gehenna, and the Lake of Fire. For Bass, these various components found in differing New Testament passages denote compartments identified within the underworld. Further, Bass considers Matthew, Luke, Paul, and Peter, as they “most fully discuss the *Descensus* in their writings” (4). The passages cited within these four authors do not explicitly give attention to Christ’s activity within the underworld, but they do operate with the assumption that a literal descent took place and Christ was exercising some sort of activity and authority.

Bass’s final chapter solidifies his primary hypothesis by arguing that “Death and Hades should be seen as personified in Revelation 1:18 and not merely the ‘realm of the dead’” (116). He concludes that Rev 1:18 is a reference to a battle won by Christ in which he was awarded the keys from death and Hades following his death and prior to his resurrection. Through his possession of the keys, Christ then releases “all the souls of the dead for the great resurrection at the last judgment” (116).

Bass constructed a challenging and helpful work regarding the topic of Jesus’s descent into the underworld following his death. His work is thorough, precise, and narrowed in such a way that it addresses the leading figures in theological studies throughout the centuries as well as the prominent perspectives potentially promoted within Scripture. Additionally, Bass never loses sight of his original thesis throughout the various chapters. In his examination of the topic, he is intentional about relating the specific content to Rev 1:18, a beneficial factor considering the scope of the work.

One of the primary strengths of the work is the renewal of a conversation often sparked by confusion based on a simplistic reading of the Apostles’ Creed. With the popularity and regular recitations of the Apostles’ Creed, it might be assumed that numerous faithful Christians are misguided in their understanding of what it means for Christ to descend into hell. With this being the case, Bass undertakes a topic of extreme importance and adds clarity to the ongoing conversation regarding the activity and location of Christ following his death. His treatment of the numerous passages of Scripture, as well as first-century understandings regarding death and Hades, proves helpful in his attempt to rightly communicate the realm of the dead as demonstrated through biblical writings.

Further, Bass is convincing in his arguments for the compartmentalization of the underworld. As noted by Bass, various ideas exist about the numerous passages that allude to an underworld consisting of numerous components. With this being the case, Bass offers an argument promoting the notion that Christ visited “one or more of these compartments” in his descent into death and Hades. Drawing from the New Testament, Bass understands death, Hades, Paradise, Abraham’s bosom, the Abyss, Tartarus, Gehenna, and the Lake of Fire as being differing compartments of the underworld. He addresses each one individually and offers compelling arguments that might challenge the reader who holds an opposing position. His ability and willingness to address these locations and the difficult passages that speak of them exemplify tremendous strength pertaining to the scholarly research he is presenting.

While the work exudes strength throughout its pages on the topic of Christ’s descent into the underworld, Bass’s overall purpose for the work is the primary weakness. To his credit, Bass attempts to weave Rev 1:18 throughout the pages of the work in the hope of supporting the thesis. However, his arguments for Rev 1:18 being viewed in light of Christ’s descent into Hades is less than convincing. Whereas Bass exemplifies scholarly research in his defense of Christ’s descent, the purpose of Christ’s descent, and the compartmentalization of the underworld, he lacks the same level of research in the chapter devoted to Rev 1:18. He overviews a few passages from Revelation and quotes several scholars, but in the end, it appears he is speculating without any hard evidence. Although the arguments for Christ’s descent into the underworld are thoroughly convincing, the idea that Rev 1:18 alludes to the descent is less than convincing.

Although Bass’s intention to prove Rev 1:18 as a confirmation of Christ’s descent into the underworld lacked substantial evidence, his overall contribution to the study of Christ’s descent is valuable. Generally, depending upon which religious or denominational persuasion one is accustomed to, the doctrine of Christ’s descent will be shaped by that group. With this being the case, numerous individuals either explain away or wrestle with the idea of Christ descended into death, Hell, or Hades. Accordingly, Bass has constructed a thorough yet concise work that is a tremendous contribution to his respected field. Not only does he offer an overview of theological thought pertaining to the descent, but he also provides an answer to where Christ went and what Christ did. While various areas of his conclusions might be speculative based upon the little biblical evidence concerning the time between the death and resurrection of Christ, he is nonetheless convincing regarding his perspective.

- *Andy Baker, First Baptist Church Oloh, Sumrall, Mississippi*

***Calvinism and the Problem of Evil.* Edited by David E. Alexander and Daniel M. Johnson. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016. 318 pages. Paperback, \$37.00.**

*Calvinism and the Problem of Evil* is a multi-author volume addressing challenges to Calvinism related to the problem of evil in order to provide philosophical answers to contemporary issues. The stated reason for this work is the prominent role libertarian freedom maintains in philosophical responses to the problem of evil despite the increased interest in Calvinist theology. Throughout this work, the authors discuss the nature of Calvinism, determinism, varieties of freewill, and evidence for Calvinism.

In chapter 1, Daniel Johnson maps different Calvinist responses to the author of sin objection and the first sin. Concerning freedom, a Calvinist can opt for the motive compatibilism of Edwards or the agent causation compatibilism of McCann that minimally requires compatibilism with the decree. Concerning God's authorship of sin, Alexander presents three different options for the Calvinist, all of which address the "doing/allowing" distinction. These include privation, the author character analogy, or denying that the distinction is metaphysical.

In chapter 2, Greg Welty argues that Molinists have no *distinct* resources to answer the charge that God is the sufficient cause of sin. Molinism contends that God's prevolitional knowledge of CCF combined with his actualization of circumstances renders him as guilty as the God of Calvinism. Welty argues that the only way out for the Molinist is the doctrine of double effect, which is not distinct to Molinism.

In chapter 3, Heath White argues that theological determinism does not make God the author of sin. God evaluates a universe with a fall but no redemption, an incarnation but no fall, and incarnation and atonement in a fallen universe. The redemption of creation appeals to God and he intends this good and the fall makes this option possible. God foresees the fall as part of what he intends but does not intend the fall.

In chapter 4, James Bruce uses Turretin as a guide to argue that God is not the author of evil. God bears a different causal relationship to sin and cannot be blamed since the objection that action and effect belong to the principle rather than instrumental cause only holds in homogenous, not heterogeneous, causes. God bears an asymmetrical relationship to good and evil. Concerning evil, God does not infuse wickedness, but decrees the action by his will and actively permits the privative action of the human agent. God causes the human will, and the human will is the cause of sin. In order to defend this notion, Turretin divides sin into three categories: the act itself, which is upheld and sustained by God; wickedness, of which God has no part; and the consequent judgment, which God permits and ordains to a good end.

In chapter 5, David Alexander mounts a cumulative case for compatibilist free will from ten doctrines for which libertarian freedom struggles to account. These doctrines include creation and sustenance, divine aseity, providence, God's moral perfection, freedom and foreknowledge, inspiration of Scripture, original sin, impeccability of Christ, salvation (God's grace is either necessary and sufficient or it is not), and the freedom of the saints in heaven who will no longer sin.

In chapter 6, Paul Helm writes on God's discrimination. God is a choosing God, as evidenced in distributing goodness throughout creation, ensuring particular outcomes, and effectually calling some. Helm's work is an exercise in faith seeking understanding, utilizing negative theology from Reformed confessions to argue that God necessarily chooses without sinning or being a divine controller.

In chapter 7, Hugh McCann addresses the relationship between grace and free will. If God can guarantee salvation and ensure damnation by his bestowal and withdrawal of grace, how are humans free? McCann argues for a non-causal theory wherein decisions are free when they are spontaneous and intentional. God employs no means spiritual or otherwise to influence the agent's decision but creates the agent in the act of deciding. The decision of the sinner to place his trust in God owes its existence to God who created that person to be who he is, a person who freely chooses to surrender to God.

In chapter 8, Anthony Pruss objects to Calvinism. Writing about the first sin, Pruss argues that determinists can go the Thomist route but this requires the problematic principle of double effect. Or, they could follow Edwards but this creates problems with the first sin. Calvinists can either adopt the Thomistic approach and develop a more sophisticated answer for God's determination of the first sin, or be Edwardsean and adopt a libertarian view of freedom in regard to the first sin.

In chapter 9, James Anderson addresses the first sin. Anderson holds that God is the author of sin but not in a morally objectionable sense. God's intentions and reasons are morally pure and justifiable, and his causative relationship to the event is *sui generis*, making it difficult to determine how culpability would transfer. He also argues that the first sin arises from a weakness of will. Persons without a weak-willed character can commit weak-willed actions.

In chapter 10, Christopher Green argues that compatibilist Calvinism provides a greater good defense. The epistemic good of knowledge comes through various presentations that reveal the character of God over time through different demonstrations of his character. It is difficult to measure how valuable the cost of these greater goods are because we do not always know who is watching (i.e., Job's example). Shifting gears, animal suffering fails to present a unique challenge to Calvinists since libertarian freedom plays no role. God uses animals to demonstrate his faithfulness to creation and the reminder of sins every year. Reminders of God's character serve as a demonstration of a greater good.

In chapter 11, Matthew Hart addresses the problem of hell from a Calvinist perspective, offering plausible reasons why God would not make all accept the offer of salvation despite his ability to determine individuals to salvation. Hell and reprobation reveal the goodness and justice of God while at the same time his love for the elect in ways that the cross of Christ are a minimal number of reprobates could not. [Unclear. Please request clarification from Mr. Sparks.]

In chapter 12, Anthony Bryson critiques Calvinism. Bryson addresses Scripture's self-attestation since Calvinist theologians conclude evil does not preclude God's existence

because Scripture testifies to his reality. He places Calvinists on the horns of a dilemma: either Calvinists use external evidence to determine which books belong in the Bible and abandon that evidence as a means of knowing Scripture's truthfulness, or they beg the question since self-attestation requires knowledge of the canon but the canon is required for self-attestation. Since self-attestation does not provide epistemically sufficient reasons for believing the Bible is God's Word, Calvinists should reconsider their arguments and take the argument from the problem of evil more seriously.

Overall, this work supplies Calvinists various options and arguments for addressing the problem of evil. The strength of the book is its multifaceted approach that either furthers the conversation or outlines different approaches one can take. The inclusion of different perspectives aids greater clarity to the boundaries and objections one must address. Given the philosophically robust chapters, *Calvinism and the Problem of Evil* is a must read for those attempting to understand and argue for or against Calvinism.

- Andrew Sparks, *The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky*

***Christ's Descent Into Hell: John Paul II, Joseph Ratzinger, and Hans Urs von Balthasar on the Theology of Holy Saturday.* By Lyra Pitstick. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016. 130 pages. Paperback, \$20.00.**

Lyra Pitstick (STD, Pontifical University of Saint Thomas Aquinas) is an independent and leading scholar on the subject of Hans Urs von Balthasar. The emphasis of her study of Balthasar involves his perspective of Holy Saturday and how it contradicts Catholic doctrine. Pitstick opens *Christ's Descent Into Hell* by posing a question serving as the book's thesis: "Does the high regard of Pope (now St.) John Paul II and Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI) for Hans Urs von Balthasar indicate approval of his controversial theology of Holy Saturday?" (xii). As Pitstick displays within the work, Balthasar holds a distinctively and novel position opposed to that of John Paul II, Ratzinger, and the overall Catholic Church. Despite Balthasar's distinctive differences on the work of Christ in the descent, both former popes affirmed Balthasar as a true teacher of the church. With this being the case, such a declaration might be perceived as a blanket affirmation of the entirety of Balthasar's doctrines, which calls into question the veracity of Catholic doctrine and tradition. Pitstick sets out to address these questions individually throughout the pages of her work.

Pitstick begins chapter 1 by establishing Balthasar's perspective of Christ's descent into hell. For Balthasar, the descent is the "pinnacle of the Trinity's self-revelation in salvation history" (1). According to Balthasar's perspective, expiation was not completed on the cross but through the intensified suffering of Jesus through his descent into hell following his death. Balthasar writes, "The Son's experience of Sheol is infinitely worse than anything we could call hell: the divine Son suffers union with the anti-divine reality of sin; He suffers the Father's wrath and rejection due to this union; and He suffers the abandonment inasmuch

as He is Son and in His very relation to the Father” (5). For Balthasar, all of this happens to absorb God’s wrath and stand in solidarity with humanity.

Chapters 2 and 3 consider the positions of Joseph Ratzinger, both before and after he was elected Pope Benedict XVI. Before being elected as pope, Ratzinger identified along similar lines with Balthasar in that he understood Christ to descend into further suffering following his death. According to Ratzinger, the suffering following the death of Christ was “ultimate loneliness” in which he entered into the “abyss of our abandonment” (9). However, following his election as Pope Benedict XVI, Ratzinger diverts from his original position. Ratzinger offers a “cautious” position in which he notes the descent to be “metaphor and image” (54). “Hell” then becomes a metaphor for earthly suffering and pain (55).

Upon offering insight into the perspectives of Balthasar and Ratzinger, Pitstick turns attention to the final of the three individuals under review, John Paul II. Whereas Ratzinger was cautious in his theological position regarding the descent, John Paul II is forthright and precise in his conclusions. According to Pitstick, John Paul II’s understanding of the descent as promulgated by the Apostles’ Creed is threefold: “Christ truly died; His resulting descent initiates his glorification; and in His descent, Christ extended his beatitude to the souls of those awaiting Him, which the living who likewise remain untied to Him will also eventually share” (60). A primary emphasis of John Paul II was the separation of Christ’s soul and body. As his body lay in the ground, as an extension of salvation, Christ’s soul descended to “the just men and women who had died before him. . . . [and he] communicates his state of beatitude to all the just whose state of death he shares in regard to the body” (63). Within the chapter, Pitstick addresses both the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and the *Roman Catechism* to elevate John Paul II’s perspective as aligning with the church, unlike the views of Balthasar and Ratzinger.

Following the overview of the three prominent Catholic teachers, Pitstick then devotes the remainder of the book to addressing the question, “Who is Right?” If Ratzinger and John Paul II were popes, and popes teach with authority and infallibility, then why do they stand in stark contrast to each other regarding this topic? Further, if the two declared Balthasar to be a true teacher of the church, yet both disagreed with his theology of Christ’s descent along with its implications, were they wrong? Pitstick unpacks these questions beginning with the standard of papal authority. She offers a thorough exegesis upon the differences of papal teachings, declarations, and the idea of *ex cathedra*. She highlights how both Ratzinger and John Paul II praised Balthasar for his theological contribution to the church as they eulogized him at his funeral. Yet, Pitstick acknowledges unashamedly Balthasar’s doctrine of descent as contradictory to Catholic teaching. Although Ratzinger and John Paul II affirm Balthasar as a true teacher and correct in his doctrine, Pitstick concludes that papal infallibility remains uncompromised and neither Balthasar’s institution as a cardinal nor the praise of Balthasar is approval of his doctrine of descent.

In *Christ's Descent into Hell*, Pitstick solidifies her position as an authoritative source on Hans Urs von Balthasar. Having already published a book focusing upon Balthasar's doctrine of descent, she masterfully turns questions arising acknowledges, given his position within the church and his seemingly contradictory doctrine. Pitstick's work contains numerous strengths. To begin, she exemplifies an extensive knowledge of the topic at hand. Pitstick demonstrates the ability to comprehend, articulate, and contrast the positions of Balthasar, Ratzinger, John Paul II, and the Catholic Church. Her well-rounded knowledge of the three theologians under review provides the necessary skills to place them into conversation with one another to support the overall purpose of the work.

Additionally, Pitstick's work begins with a clear thesis and necessary question naturally arising from the close relationships between Balthasar, Ratzinger, and John Paul II, as well as the papal affirmation of Balthasar as a true teacher of the church. A thorough reader of Roman Catholic theology as well as Balthasar's unique perspective of the descent might question the discernment of the two popes closest to Balthasar and his high praise from many within the Roman Catholic Church. Writing from a Roman Catholic perspective, Pitstick provides a thorough and concise overview of papal infallibility that helps preserve the Roman Catholic elevation of their popes, while maintaining Catholic doctrine and tradition.

Although Pitstick writes from a position favorable to the Roman Catholic tradition, she nonetheless demonstrates a level of academic research that possesses a minimal amount of bias. Given her bent toward Balthasar as the focus of her life's work, she does not seek to elevate him as a theologian without flaws. Instead, she demonstrates honest research, highlighting both his strengths and his weaknesses. Further, she does not shy away from noting the differences in Balthasar, Ratzinger, and John Paul II as it relates to church doctrine. She investigates each category thoroughly, drawing attention to both the differences and similarities, never failing to address the deviations. Once more, Pitstick's research is immensely helpful on the subject.

As there are numerous strengths found within Pitstick's work, few weaknesses exist. However, one of the weaknesses of the work is the unnecessary addition of chapter 5 regarding the theology Christoph Schönborn. Whereas Pitstick emphasizes Schönborn's comments of Balthasar's descent doctrine by neither confirming nor denying what Balthasar concludes, the chapter adds little to the work.

The significance of Pitstick's contribution relating to the work of Hans Urs von Balthasar and the doctrine of descent must not be overlooked. She has demonstrated an exhaustive knowledge of the topic in such a way that she can interact with numerous sources, thinkers, and doctrines to put forth a well-articulated compilation of theologically-versed material beneficial to all interested in the subject. Her desire to be truthful in demonstrating scholarly research does not go unnoticed. Additionally, her clarification and precision

in defining certain terms are helpful. For any student seeking further knowledge of the subject, Pitstick's work must be consulted.

- *Andy Baker, First Baptist Church Oloh, Sumrall, Mississippi*

***Creation Care: A Biblical Theology of the Natural World.* By Douglas J. Moo and Jonathan A. Moo. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018. 256 pages. Paperback, \$24.99.**

In the current age of hyper-partisan polarity, civility and open-mindedness are rare traits driving conversations. Climate change, one of a few explosive, political issues, has the potential to be a mine-field of partisan rhetoric. New political platforms centered around a "Green New Deal" can evoke visceral reactions during small talk among the pews at churches. Douglas and Jonathan Moo have written a fresh, invigorating, apolitical, and most importantly, scriptural view entitled *Creation Care*. Rather than stating partisan rhetoric, the authors are intent on discovering "the role of the created world in God's plan for the universe" (23). Furthermore, the overarching question is defined as such: "What role does the non-human creation play in God's plan?" (23).

Douglas Moo (PhD, University of St. Andrews) is currently the Kenneth T. Wessner Professor of New Testament at Wheaton College. He has written extensively in the field of New Testament studies and serves as the chair of the NIV Committee on Bible Translation. Jonathan Moo (PhD, University of Cambridge) is currently an associate professor of New Testament and Environmental Studies at Whitworth University. His research interests and writing have focused on early Judaism and Christianity's understanding of nature.

*Creation Care* is divided into three parts, as reflected in the "Biblical Theology for Life" series: Queuing the Questions (chapters 1 and 2), Arriving at Answers (chapters 3 through 9), and Reflecting on Relevance (chapters 10 through 14). The Scriptural basis of the authors' argument comes in Part Two, which encompasses more than half the material in the book. Part Three, focused more on the ethics of creation care, constitutes a quarter of the book. Part One functions as an extended introduction with two chapters developing the purpose of the book and research question, which is stated above. Three indices follow the content of the book divided into Scripture, subject, and author. The indices provide a helpful tool for the individual looking for further study on the topic.

After the authors frame the question in Part One, they begin their argument in Part Two. Specifically, the authors focus on developing a biblical theology centered on Scripture. Part Two focuses on the theme of creation throughout all of Scripture. The authors contend that creation is a natural and necessary part of God's redemptive purposes in the world (50). Followers of Christ should view the world in such a way that God views the world (67). Furthermore, because of sin, creation groans and continues being refined (102). The authors argue, "If the land mourns, creation groans, and God himself weeps over the ruin

of the earth, we surely cannot sit idly by when we see the destruction of creation” (111). Thus, a key for understanding creation care is for the Christian not only to view the land as God does (chapter 5) but to understand that the gospel includes being good stewards of creation (123). Two major commands by Jesus are to love God and love others (Matt 22:36–40; Mark 12:30–31; Luke 10:27). Loving our neighbors, indirectly, is a way to care for creation. Often, major side effects of industrialization around the globe cause bad working conditions for vulnerable populations. Thus, creation care is a necessary step in serving the “least of these” (178).

The argument is most pointed in chapters 8 and 9. The authors have been laying out a comprehensive case for creation care as found throughout Scripture. In these two chapters, specific focus is given to Gal 6:15 and 2 Cor 5:17 (chapter 8) and Rom 8:19–22, 2 Pet 3:3–14, and Is 65–66 (chapter 9). The authors use proper hermeneutics to exegete these passages in their proper contexts. The authors argue that the passages being studied show a creation that will ultimately be *transformed* only by God (127). Yet, humans have dominion over creation, not to exploit creation, but to care for creation in a way that is pleasing to God. The writers focus their argument on the larger corpus of Scripture but use these five examples to ground their argument for a world being transformed only by God.

Part Three focuses on the ethics of creation care. They use specific examples (i.e., the Keystone Pipeline) to argue that the truths understood in Scripture can be manifested in different ways. The authors distinguish the truths found in Scripture and the ethics of applying those truths. A necessary amount of wisdom is needed to live out the truths found in Scripture (chapter 12). The final two chapters offer the most poignant application of Scripture for the Christian today. The authors show that although the Christian is commanded to care for creation, not every environmental cause is a worthy cause (189–90). In chapter 13, the authors show that creation is indeed in crisis, mainly due to human activity (197–219). The writers argue that the human population, which has exponentially grown over the past century, has influenced creation in multiple ways. This unprecedented population growth has caused biodiversity, forests, oceans, agriculture, and the climate to suffer in recent decades. The authors show broad, diverse, scientific data to back up their claims on these issues. Finally, the authors develop the acrostic AWAKE (Attentiveness, Walking, Activism, Konsumerism, Eating) to help the individual become aware and take part in creation care. The main thrust of the authors’ argument for creation care is that Christians should “preach and teach the whole of the gospel” (221). Moreover, we should have a “posture towards God’s creation of gratefulness, joy, and worship” (222).

The authors develop a holistic argument for creation care that is grounded in gospel proclamation rather than a progressive, political agenda, which may or may not be popular for everyone. God cares for his creation; therefore, we must care for (i.e., be good stewards of) creation as well. This earth will be transformed, as the authors argue, into the new earth only by God’s decisive action. Yet, part of the redemptive process is serving God

by stewarding his creation. A minor critique of the work is found in the absence of a bibliography. Solid citations are found in the footnotes, but a bibliography of further reading on creation care would have been helpful for further study. The footnotes in chapter 14 and quotes by Wendell Berry provide helpful sources for future study.

*Creation Care* is a must-read for the lay-person and scholar. The authors argue a solid, biblical case for creation care. The pastor will find their presentation of the scriptural material helpful in better understanding the topic. Also, the authors give a case for creation care that is apolitical. Undoubtedly, *Creation Care* will evoke certain responses depending on one's political affiliations. However, Douglas and Jonathan Moo argue convincingly for the Christian to be involved in creation care. The work is highly recommended.

- Matthew Burks, *New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana*

***A Defense of Free Grace Theology: With Respect to Saving Faith, Perseverance, and Assurance.* Edited by Fred Chay. The Woodlands, TX: Grace Theology Press, 2017. 628 pages. Paperback, \$23.99.**

Comprised of five authors and edited by Fred Chay (PhD, Dallas Theological Seminary), professor of pastoral theology at Grace School of Theology in The Woodlands, Texas, *A Defense of Free Grace Theology* is (as the title suggests) both a defense of Free Grace theology (hereafter FGT) as well as a formal response to Wayne Grudem's *"Free Grace" Theology: 5 Ways It Diminishes the Gospel* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016). The authors of this book formalize a defense against what they see as unfair and inaccurate accusations against FGT by Grudem while also mounting an offense against traditional understandings of soteriology that would suggest repentance and good works are required for salvation. In short, FGT claims that faith (trust, reliance, and appropriation) in Christ alone is essential for salvation and that repentance (as understood as a turning away or removal from sin) matched with obedience (characterized as spiritual fruit and good works) are not essential actions or requirements for salvation (71–74, 96–97). The book is divided into two sections beginning with twelve chapters on theological topics followed by another twelve chapters on biblical proof texts.

Chay begins the book by acknowledging Grudem as both a Christian brother and friend while also affirming that Grudem grossly misrepresented their theology. While their view is expressly different than Grudem's Reformed theology, it is nonetheless biblically faithful and affirmed by some orthodox theologians. In response to Grudem, chapter 2 attempts to make the case that Free Grace theology is not novel, idiosyncratic, or without historic support. The author of this chapter, Ken Wilson (MD, University of Texas; DPhil, University of Oxford) claims that the earliest Christians held to justification by faith alone until Augustine corrupted the church's doctrine of grace through his Manichaean, Stoic, and Neoplatonist philosophies.

Chapter 3, authored by David R. Anderson (PhD, Dallas Theological Seminary), president of Grace School of Theology, provides clarification of *FGT*'s understanding of *faith*. Contrary to Grudem's accusation that *FGT* reduces faith to mere intellectual assent, Anderson clarifies that saving faith also entails trust and assent in the person and work of Christ. Such faith, though, should not be considered as obedience and good works, for such would then not be grace (in their view). Chapter 4, also by Anderson, develops the *FGT*'s understanding of repentance. *FGT* defines repentance as a change of mind and remorse for sin, not a turning away from sin itself. Repentance is not essential for one's justification, though it is essential for sanctification and fellowship with God (99).

Joseph Dillow (ThD, Dallas Theological Seminary) affirms in chapter 5, contrary to Grudem's accusation, that *FGT* believes good works are a necessary result of having saving faith; however, they are not conditions for or causes of salvation. Such would nullify grace, in their view. Dillow returns in chapter 6 to define *FGT*'s understanding of James 2:20–24. The central thesis to this chapter is that James is speaking not of a faith that saves people from eternal damnation but a walk of faith that will not save people from the perils of sin in this life. Dillow returns in chapter 7 to address James 2:17 where he asserts that one's walk of faith is dead (or useless) unless good works are present, yet this does not mean that one has to do good works to be saved. Having provided a historical survey of the Reformed notion of assurance, Dillow returns in chapter 8 to argue that one should look solely to Christ, not one's good works or spiritual fruit, for assurance of salvation. The matters of eternal security and assurance of faith are further developed in chapters 9–10 with the affirmation that *FGT* holds to the possibility of losing salvation should one remain a "carnal Christian" (310). Good works do matter in *FGT* and will be the basis for rewards and status in heaven, claims Dillow in chapters 11–12, though they are not mandated for entrance into heaven.

Whereas the first section attempted to respond to Grudem theologically, the second section attempts to defend their theology with biblical evidence. Dillow analyzes Luke 18 and the story of the rich young ruler in chapter 13. There, Dillow claims the young man wanted a heavenly reward, not salvation. As such, good works are not essential to one's justification. Similarly, Dillow addresses in chapter 14 the question of whether all true believers must persevere in good works in order to be saved, based upon the Reformed interpretation of Matt 7:13–29. For *FGT*, Jesus is not speaking about soteriology but how a believer can pursue the kingdom way of life. Dillow provides a similar *apologia* in chapters 15–16 on John 15 concerning what is truly meant by branches who bear and do not bear fruit. The central concern is fellowship with Jesus (sanctification), not regeneration or justification, in his view.

Chay returns in chapter 17 with critical analysis of Rom 2:1–13 with the conclusion that rewards (not final salvation) are by works. Anderson, in chapter 18, examines how Rom 7–8 is understood in *FGT* in light of a Christian's struggle against sin. Chay returns for the

next two chapters to define the meaning of 2 Cor 13:5–6 (the call to test oneself to see if one is in the faith) and Gal 5:6 concerning faith working through love. Chapter 21 by Anderson explores Eph 2:1. For *FGT*, one is merely “dead” specifically in trespasses and sin. This does not, in their view, uphold Reformed notions of total depravity as if a spiritual corpse were in focus; rather, this refers to the spiritual separation of a non-believer and God. The ultimate aim of these chapters is to provide alternative interpretations to traditional understandings of soteriology that make obedience an essential requirement for salvation. Chapters 22–24 continue this theme through explorations of Col 1:22–23, 2 Pet 1:10–11, and 1 John.

While reading *A Defense of Free Grace Theology*, this reader was reminded of the New Perspective on Paul. While these two parties differ significantly, they nonetheless both challenged more than five hundred years of thinking on soteriology and call for major reinterpretations of key texts (though not without strong argumentation and biblical support). As Christian theologians, we are on a quest to understand truth as God has revealed it through his Word. We are mindful that God has much to reveal therein and that our previous understandings may err; however, when a book such as this comes along and challenges not only five hundred years’ worth of historic, Protestant interpretations but even classifies Augustine as a heretic, the reader has every warrant to be cautious (and even skeptical). Claiming repentance (as understood as a turning away from sin) and a transformed life (referring to sanctification) are not essential to receiving eternal life is a bold claim. It warrants thoughtful consideration and response from those who would uphold the classical soteriology of repentance and faith being two sides to the same coin.

The authors succeeded in their purpose of addressing Grudem’s claims while providing a more developed theology of *Free Grace* soteriology. However, they did not (nor did they ever claim to) solve the matter. One hopes that the clarifications provided in this volume will further irenic discussions concerning issues that both parties consider an in-house debate among Christians.

- Daniel Kirkpatrick, University of the Southwest and Southeastern Baptist Association, Hobbs, New Mexico

***Evangelical Scholarship, Retrospects and Prospects: Essay in Honor of Stanley N. Gundry.* Edited by Dirk R. Buursma, Katya Covrett, and Verlyn D. Verbrugge. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2017. 271 pages. Hardcover, \$49.99.**

This *festschrift* was written in honor of the various accomplishments of Stanley N. Gundry. The volume describes Gundry as having five main characteristics: pastor, publisher, mentor, friend, and scholar. In his earlier years, Gundry served as a local pastor. While Gundry’s time in the pastorate was short-lived, his pastoral heart carried over into his work as a publisher for Zondervan. According to this volume, many can testify to how Gundry “lives out his faith” as both a mentor and friend (11). Thus, Gundry is described as “a man who stands up for what is right and . . . takes joy in pointing others to our common mission as believers in the Lord Jesus” (10).

Gundry is also a scholar. Gundry received his Bachelor of Divinity from Talbot Theological Seminary, his Master of Sacred Theology from Union College of British Columbia, and his Doctor of Sacred Theology from the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago. As well as being the executive vice president and editor-in-chief for Zondervan, Gundry is also currently serving as an adjunct professor of historical theology at Grand Rapids Theological Seminary. There he teaches a course on American Evangelicalism. Gundry's contribution to the evangelical movement cannot be understated and is highlighted by numerous articles within this *festschrift*.

During the past eighty years, American Evangelicalism has been characterized by a variety of definitions and theological diversity. The "adjective *evangelical* has even been applied to atheism" (35, italics original). Millard J. Erickson's contribution to this volume traces this eighty-year development. Erickson divides these years into The Period of Consolidation (1937–1947), The Period of Construction (1947–1977), and The Period of Controversy (1977–present). Beginning in 1937, evangelical churches began to grow and consolidate. Also, they began to construct "thorough definitions" of important doctrines fundamental to the faith, and soon, this led to several controversies over these fundamental doctrines (39). Erickson's historical outline is helpful for understanding modern debates within the evangelical movement.

Interestingly, Erickson argues that "in light of these developments," modern evangelicals should "shift our focus from *what we debate* and the position we take, to the *right to debate* and to hold conclusions" (52, italics original). The details of Erickson's argument are further explained in his article and are beyond the scope of this review. Still, Erickson's statement is of interest primarily because Erickson appears to align himself with the purpose behind Zondervan's Counterpoint Series. Gundry serves as the chief editor of the Counterpoint series, and it was under "his leadership" that this series began to take shape (27).

The importance of Erickson's statement is also found in John D. Woodbridge's contribution to this *festschrift*. Woodbridge's article is the longest in the volume. His article explores various aspects of the fundamentalist-modernist controversy through the lens of Charles Woodbridge, John's father. Charles Woodbridge's perspective of this controversy is enlightening because he "interacted personally with two iconic figures engaged directly or indirectly" in the debate, J. Gresham Machen and Adolph von Harnack (68).

While Machen was a strong, Presbyterian fundamentalist, von Harnack was a liberal Protestant who "would not say that Jesus was God incarnate" (81). Even so, John Woodbridge traces his father's interactions with both Machen and von Harnack and notes that even though these scholars disagreed on major issues of the faith, they still "admired each other" (102). In fact, von Harnack appreciated "Machen's objectivity" (78). John Woodbridge contrasts this with fellow Presbyterians who labeled Machen as "bitter" (95) simply because he "faithfully upheld a very high view of the Bible's authority and emphasized

Scripture's inerrancy" (106). There is a noticeable quandary when one's own denomination would label anyone who consistently follows its statement of belief as "bitter" while an outsider to the denomination can praise this same person's reliability. Thus, returning once again to Erickson's statement, far too often, the goal of evangelicals has been to argue why everyone else is wrong instead of guiding debates towards a common means of objectivity.

Such a goal appears to have been in the mind of Gundry. Many of the volumes he edited at Zondervan find alignment with this goal. An article contributed to this *festschrift* by Stanley Gundry's brother, Robert H. Gundry, notes that Stanley was raised by fundamental missionaries, attended school with Quakers, listened to Southern Baptist preachers, and attended Pentecostal revivals (21–22). Thus, Stanley Gundry has long had a concern for "missiology and the worldwide church" (26). As such, this *festschrift* is a wonderful tribute to Gundry's diversity, considering his commitment to many evangelical doctrines viewed as fundamental to the faith.

In all, the volume is a wonderful read. The collection contains a variety of opinions from scholars of various expertise. The contributors include Craig L. Blomberg ("Does the Quest for the Historical Jesus Still Hold Any Promise"), Gordon D. Fee ("On Women Remaining Silent in Churches"), Karen H. Jobes ("It Is Written': The Septuagint and Evangelical Doctrine of Scripture"), Tremper Longman III ("What Was Said in All the Scriptures Concerning Himself' [Luke 24:27]: Reading the Old Testament as a Christian"), Richard J. Mouw ("Faithfulness in a 'Counterpoint' World"), Ruth A. Tucker ("Eve, Jezebel, and the Woman at the Well"), John Walton ("The Tower of Babel and the Covenant"), and Christopher J. H. Wright ("The Missional Nature and Role of Theological Education"). While these scholars would not agree on every aspect of evangelical doctrine, they appear to agree on the necessity of proclaiming the wisdom of Christ to a foolish and dying world. These scholars desire to do this in a way that is both honorable to God as well as academically inclined. In various cases, this means there will be controversy, but controversy does not necessitate division. Instead, evangelicals should unite under the One who is greater than all human understanding. While this volume will present some views that are controversial and untenable to some conservative readers, it does present a scholarly appeal on a variety of issues related to the evangelical movement.

- Ron Lindo, *New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana*

***Introducing the New Testament: A Historical, Literary, and Theological Survey.* 2nd ed. By Mark Allan Powell. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018. 591 pages. Hardcover, \$49.99.**

The Rev. Dr. Mark Allan Powell is the Robert and Phyllis Leatherman Professor of New Testament at Trinity Lutheran Seminary at Capital University in Columbus, Ohio. He has published extensively in the disparate fields of New Testament studies, specializing in the Synoptics, narrative criticism, and historical Jesus studies, and contemporary music, both sacred and secular. He is an ordained minister in the Evangelical Lutheran Church and holds a BA from Texas Lutheran College, an MDiv from Trinity Lutheran Seminary, and a PhD from Union Theological Seminary. Powell also serves as editor for the *HarperCollins Bible Dictionary* and has chaired SBL sections on historical Jesus studies and the Gospel of Matthew. His most acclaimed work has been this textbook, *Introducing the New Testament*, first published in 2009.

This second edition builds on the strengths of the first: 1) fair and mostly unbiased presentation of multiple solutions for divisive issues without a strong stance for either “conservative” or “liberal” positions, 2) extensive inclusion of beautiful Christian artwork through the centuries for illustrative and aesthetic purposes, and 3) a companion website containing a plethora of additional teaching and study resources, including video introductions to each chapter, tables and charts from the book, and quizzes over material in each chapter. Additions to this edition include a chapter on Jewish backgrounds to the NT and updates to the suggested “further reading” for each chapter.

Powell organizes his textbook in 30 chapters, providing three chapters of background information at the beginning, two chapters on the significant figures of Jesus and Paul, and two chapters on the gospels and the letters generally. The remaining 23 chapters deal with specific NT books (the Pastorals and the Johannine correspondence each comprise one chapter instead of three) in canonical order. This structure leads to a few repetitions of material (see 115 and 123 on the authorship of Matthew), but largely proves successful. Some prefer a chronological order, particularly of Paul’s letters, but Powell’s “middle of the road” approach lends itself better to canonical ordering because no decisions on authorship or provenance precede setting the textbook layout. For each NT book, he includes sections of overview, historical background, major themes, conclusion, and bibliography. Particular books might include another section pertaining more directly to them, such as a section on practical matters in 1 Corinthians and on the distinctives of each gospel in those chapters. The “further reading” sections at the end of each chapter are generally the only interaction with external sources (with a few exceptions, such as some primary source material, generally noted parenthetically, but also footnoted for quotations, as on 255).

The companion website contains a few bugs—links that direct to error messages, a requirement to provide an email address before accessing anything, a different URL than given in the textbook—but the additional information allows the textbook to become

suitable for graduate-level classes as well as its primary target of undergraduate if utilized properly. For instance, in the first chapter on the Roman world, Powell mentions three Roman emperors briefly but (rightly) concludes that “the local Roman rulers [in Palestine] had more immediate relevance than emperors in faraway Rome” (19). However, on the website, he includes a table listing all the Roman emperors during the first century CE with their dates and descriptions, information which is crucial to understanding the bigger picture of Judaism and Christianity’s intersection with world history and which would be standard fare for graduate classes in NT ([http://www.textbookesources.bpgftp.com/Powell\\_Explore/1.3.htm](http://www.textbookesources.bpgftp.com/Powell_Explore/1.3.htm)).

Generally, the background material is well-written and covers a broad range of topics suitable for undergraduate NT classes or for seminary students being exposed to the information for the first time in a NT survey class. A few areas of strength for Powell include 1) redaction and narrative criticisms of the gospels—thus, he gives incredible tables listing distinctives of each gospel and passionate statements summarizing each gospel writers’ presentation of Jesus, 2) skill in concise summary—his charts and tables throughout the book are stellar for visual processors and mnemonic purposes, and 3) the ability to present both sides of an argument clearly and *with supporting evidence* (see discussion of Paul’s view of homosexuality, 276). This last would be especially helpful in conservative settings where future pastors and apologists need to be exposed to arguments from opposing opinions to know how to engage them. Conservative textbooks which only provide evidence for traditional ecclesial positions do not always adequately prepare students for their future vocations, but more liberal textbooks tend to treat issues like dating and authorship of NT books, not to mention theological matters, in a manner unacceptable to confessional institutions.

One weakness of the book is its treatment of sociological information—though Powell includes several excellent works on first-century social/cultural backgrounds in his “further reading” section, his summary of “the pivotal social value in the New Testament world” (33), honor and shame, presents misleading information. Powell states that shame is the opposite of honor and that it “was to be avoided at all costs” (33), but in fact, most social-science scholars, including those in his bibliography, explain that honor and shame function together in assigning and preserving a person’s status and value. Shame serves a positive role when people (especially females and slaves) maintain their “privacy, reserve, and purity.”<sup>1</sup>

Another weakness is the lack of interaction with other secondary sources in the field. Though Powell obviously has gleaned information from recent scholarship (for example, information on the New Perspective on Paul is included and summarized well, 277–82),

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Plevnik, “Honor/Shame” in *Handbook of Biblical Social Values*, ed. John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998), 107.

he gives students only a list of 5–10 sources at the end of each section to continue their research and does not note which sources are most valuable for particular types of research. Without footnotes or endnotes, students would not be able to tell easily from where the information came.

Overall, I would highly recommend this book for pastors wanting a quick overview of each NT book and critical issues, students in a NT survey class, or professors needing some quick tables and charts to use as visual aids and study assignments. The few drawbacks do not negate the excellent scholarship, moderate tone, and appealing visuals of this engaging textbook.

- Allyson Presswood Nance, *New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana*

***Knowing Creation: Perspectives from Theology, Philosophy, and Science. Volume 1.* Edited by Andrew B. Torrance and Thomas H. McCall. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018. 341 pages. Paperback, \$39.99.**

For too long, the conflict narrative has dominated the conversation between science and religion, causing Christians to be hesitant even to use the word creation in the public sphere. *Knowing Creation* is a response to this current state of affairs. In *Knowing Creation*, Andrew B. Torrance and Thomas H. McCall compile and edit essays from leading Christian scholars in the areas of theology, biblical studies, philosophy, and science to provide a constructive Christian alternative to knowing the natural world as creation. The book consists of an introduction from Torrance and McCall, sixteen chapters comprised of four essays from each of the fields mentioned above, and followed by helpful subject, Scripture, and author indices.

Torrance and McCall's purpose for *Knowing Creation* is to find points of commonality concerning creation between Christian theologians, biblical scholars, philosophers, and scientists. This allows and encourages an interdisciplinary and mutually edifying conversation between Christians without the vitriol that often accompanies competing views of creation within the church. The contributors "seek to challenge the suspicion surrounding the term [creation] by presenting a broad picture of creation that finds harmony with both contemporary science and orthodox Christian theology" (17). Their purpose is not for scientists to introduce creation into science textbooks or for theologians to ground their theology of creation in the natural sciences, but to find ways in which the two fields complement each other in order to "offer a constructive way forward for thinking about creation in a more holistic manner" (22). By bringing together scholars from several areas of expertise, they overcome the problem of compartmentalization that plagues academia, while providing a more balanced understanding of creation which is mutually beneficial and edifying for both Christian theology and science. Their approach in focusing on points of harmony between Christian theology and science is refreshing in contrast to the conflict narrative that has dominated the conversation, even among Christians.

Two commendable themes emerge throughout the book. First, Christians should not be hesitant to recognize and identify nature as created by God. Denis R. Alexander and Torrance discourage Christian scientists from using methodological naturalism as they carry out the enterprise of science. Naturalism is a philosophical commitment to strictly natural causes and explanations for natural phenomena, which is a contradiction to the Christian worldview that identifies God as the creator and sustainer of the natural order. Naturalism unnecessarily constrains scientific inquiry, while at the same time extending science beyond its legitimate boundaries by assuming that it can eliminate metaphysical causation for the material universe.

Furthermore, Randall C. Zachman and Alexander demonstrate that Christian natural philosophers laid the foundation for the modern scientific enterprise. They recognize that God's providence is seen clearly in the "nomic regularity" of nature, which is the very reason why the scientific method is so successful (270). Christians should be the ones leading the way in the field of science, investigating the works of God in nature with a sense of wonder and gratitude.

Since Christian scientists are not inhibited by the constructs of naturalism and a Christian worldview promotes scientific inquiry, Mark Harris and Tom McLeish, both scientists, recognize a need for a theology of nature and science. They are not proposing inserting theology into science but instead establishing a theological matrix within which scientific discovery can be interpreted. Without a proper foundation for knowing creation, the differing fields of science become disjointed. Theology is shown to provide a unifying framework. Robert C. Koons and William M. R. Simpson provide a perfect example of this by showing how scientific reductionism has obscured the purpose and function of creation. They both promote a return to an Aristotelian idea used in Thomas Aquinas's Fifth Way, based on modern scientific discoveries in quantum mechanics and the reality of emergent phenomena (221). Christian scientists can use teleology to show that there is an intentional design found in nature which determines the underlying purpose of nature and that God, as Creator, is the "ultimate source and ground of teleology" (235).

A second theme is that a Christian worldview promotes an appreciation and care for creation. Marilyn McCord Adams and John H. Walton both compare mankind to priests of nature. Adams writes, "As chosen priests, our cultic work is to cooperate with God to make the holiness of material creation ever more manifest. We do this by growing into the knowledge and love of God and one another, by owning God's purposes as our purposes, by exercising camaraderie toward our fellow priests, and by showing courtesy toward God's nonpersonal creatures" (178). In the same vein, Simon Oliver encourages Christians to recognize creation as a good gift from God, and Christoph Schwöbel posits that God's creation bears meaning and dignity. Christians should not only be leading the way in scientific investigation but also in conservation and stewardship of nature as an expression of gratitude to God for his gift of creation.

One of the weaknesses of *Knowing Creation* is the contributions from biblical scholars, which falls short in providing mutually beneficial and edifying views on the doctrine of creation. In order to harmonize contemporary science and theology, novel interpretations of the Bible are presented that many Christians would find unacceptable and surprising. Walton and Francis Watson discourage reading modern science into the text of Genesis, which results in apparent competition between the two. While this is a responsible interpretive model, what is objectionable are the novel reinterpretations of biblical texts and their perspective of truth. Walton provides a novel interpretation of Genesis, while William P. Brown comes to an unusual conclusion about the book of Job. Francis Watson submits an untenably subjective view of truth in which he envisions “two true yet incommensurable accounts of the world’s origins” (128). These essays may help to bring unity amongst Christian biblical scholars and scientists, but can, unfortunately, cause division between Christians who interpret the biblical accounts differently.

When the created nature of the cosmos is grasped, it provides a more complete scientific understanding of the origins and purpose of the created order. Theologians and scientists both benefit from knowing God as Creator. Christians do not have to be ashamed to affirm creation, realizing that a theological perspective enhances our understanding of the world. Therefore, Christians should be emboldened to lead the way in exploring God’s good creation.

Overall, *Knowing Creation* is a challenging and important book. Many of the essays require careful thought, if not a little homework, but the relationship between science and religion concerning creation is an important topic in modern culture worth the time and effort. Christian theologians and pastors, as leaders, should be informed concerning modern scholarship on this relevant topic. This does not mean that the reader must agree with every conclusion but at least be informed enough to be a part of the conversation. Torrance and McCall have made a significant contribution to the dialogue between science and faith, which deserves to be read and considered with an open mind.

- Tyler Dean, *New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana*

***A Legacy of Preaching*. 2 vols. Edited by Benjamin K. Forrest, Kevin L. King, Bill Curtis, and Dwayne Milioni. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018. 1,088 pages. Hardback, \$79.99.**

*A Legacy of Preaching* is a two-volume compendium of current scholarship on key individuals who have proclaimed the gospel during the first 2,000 years of church history. Each of the sixty entries includes an impressive list of associated books and articles for further study.

Volume One addresses thirty preachers from the early church to the revivalists of the eighteenth-century, beginning with the New Testament sermons of the Apostle Paul and concluding with the open-air preaching of George Whitefield. Volume Two begins

with the nineteenth-century European Charles Simeon and concludes with twentieth-century American preachers who are quite different, such as Harry Emerson Fosdick and Jerry Falwell. The preachers are listed chronologically and grouped with those who faced theological and cultural issues of their time and location.

The four editors are qualified to manage the project. Benjamin K. Forrest is associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Liberty University. Kevin L. King is professor of homiletics and historical theology at Liberty University. Bill Curtis is assistant professor of homiletics at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Dwayne Milioni is assistant professor of preaching and coordinator of the PhD in preaching at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. King and Curtis also serve as pastors of local churches.

The editors enlisted the contributions of various scholars through a random email from an unknown “colleague” (1:17). Contributors include men and women from various denominations, many of whom have previously published works on the preachers they write about in this work.

The editors set a goal of presenting “a historical, theological, and methodological introduction to the history of preaching” (1:27). They also wanted to assist present-day preachers in formulating their own preaching styles using the preaching that has taken place in the history of the church (1:28).

The editors confess that their selection of preachers will not satisfy every reader. They hope to stimulate readers to research further their favorite preachers who may have been omitted. Nevertheless, each one included has been analyzed according to his or her historical background, theology of preaching, methodology, and lasting contributions to Christian preaching.

While the editors hope to benefit pastors, students, and researchers, each reader will need to decide how best to use the information provided. Pastors will probably like to use the biographical or theological material in their own sermons. Students might discover a pulpit model for personal emulation. Researchers can use the footnotes and bibliographies to inspire deeper study.

The names of many of the preachers included will be familiar to students of homiletics, but some may not be as familiar. Luminaries like Martin Luther, George Whitefield, Charles Spurgeon, and Billy Graham are to be expected, but Johannes Tauler, Balthasar Hubmaier, George Liele, and John Jasper might not be as well known.

The inclusion of two female preachers was unexpected but refreshing. Catherine Booth was the wife of William Booth and instrumental in the founding and development of the Salvation Army. She was committed to the authority of the Bible and believed that

she was called by God to preach (2:91–92). Aimee Semple McPherson “utilized the latest technologies to deliver her sermons and teachings, becoming one of the first female preachers on the radio” (2:395).

Men who preached the Bible with the goal of social justice are also included. Prominent in the twentieth century were Martin Luther King, Jr. and E. V. Hill. King led the civil rights movement as a preacher and opened the door for others to follow. Hill followed a similar preaching path toward social justice as the pastor of Mount Zion Baptist Church in Watts, California. The drive toward social justice from these two men was matched by the homiletical theorizing of Gardner C. Taylor. These examples demonstrate that the variety of preachers included in this project will appeal to a wide audience.

*A Legacy of Preaching*, therefore, is a good read for anyone interested in how the gospel has been proclaimed by various Christians in different eras. These volumes also serve as a valuable resource for understanding Christian preaching that is shaped by theological, cultural, and social changes. However, not all of the individuals included will provide equal benefit. The inclusion of some individuals seems questionable since none of their sermons have survived (e.g., William Tyndale) or because they ministered primarily in the classroom rather than in the pulpit of a church or an evangelistic meeting (e.g., J. I. Packer). Although the contributions of Tyndale to biblical translation and of Packer to teaching cannot be denied, their lasting legacy might better be included in a book more devoted to historical Christianity rather than homiletical Christianity.

Apart from these minor concerns, the reader will gain a greater appreciation of the variety of personalities and methodologies that have helped people accept Jesus as Savior and stake their eternal future on what they heard from these preachers. *A Legacy of Preaching* is, therefore, a testimony to the creative work of the Holy Spirit who uses imperfect humans to communicate a perfect message as well as to the contributions of each preacher who is obedient to the Spirit’s leadership. This two-volume work is a resource to be consulted often and is recommended for all students of Christian preaching.

- Paul Hussey, *Delacroix Hope Baptist Church and Nunez Community College*

***Old Testament Ethics: A Guided Tour.* By John Goldingay. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019. 288 pages. Paperback, \$28.00.**

John Goldingay is an internationally-recognized scholar in the field of Old Testament studies. A PhD graduate of the University of Nottingham, he taught for many years at Fuller Theological Seminary in California. He recently returned to England. His many publications include a recent translation of the Old Testament, a seventeen-volume commentary series on the Old Testament, and a three-volume set on Old Testament theology. He is a Church of England minister as well as a professor.

Goldingay describes *Old Testament Ethics* as a spin-off from his commentary series titled “The Old Testament for Everyone” (vii). He offered a fuller study of many ethical topics in *Old Testament Theology Volume Three: Israel’s Life* (IVP Academic, 2009). The book reviewed here is a brief introduction to many topics written for lay people rather than fellow scholars. In the introduction, Goldingay describes the nature of ethics and suggests he will focus on “the Old Testament’s own agenda and how it raises questions that we have to respond to” (2).

The book is divided into five major sections with several brief chapters in each part. Part One deals with “Qualities” and includes discussions of topics such as Godlikeness, compassion, anger, and forthrightness. Goldingay carefully describes each character trait and offers numerous biblical texts on the subject. Although the focus is on the Old Testament, he frequently notes the New Testament as well. Part Two, “Aspects of Life,” treats several human thoughts and actions. The nine chapters include mind and heart, violence, shalom, justice, sabbath, and animals. Part Three focuses on “Relationships.” The author devotes several chapters to topics such as friends, neighbors, family, and sexual relations. He then expands the category to include nations, cities, and leadership. The controversial topic of migrants also gets a brief chapter. In Part Four, “Texts,” he shifts to several classic Old Testament texts that stress ethics. Specific texts studied include Gen 1 and 2, Lev 25, Deut 15 and 20, Ps 72, and the books of Ruth and Song of Solomon. Classic ethical issues such as divorce, war, and sexuality are highlighted in some of these passages. In Part Five, Goldingay turns to brief character sketches that offer realistic depictions of Abraham, Sarah and Hagar, Shiphrah, Puah, Yokebed, Miryam, David, Nehemiah, Vashti, Esther, and Mordecai (The spelling of some of these names reflects his own translations.). Goldingay wraps up his book with a brief conclusion and postscript on the violent conquest of Canaan.

Overall, Goldingay’s work is an engaging and provocative discussion of a wide range of issues. A reader could dip into the book at many places, but the book is short enough to invite study of the entire work. Goldingay offers short Hebrew word studies of key terms. For example, he notes that “compassion” comes from the Hebrew word for womb (15). He gives many examples of Old Testament texts on each subject. His own translation offers a refreshing approach to the texts. Putting brief and long quotations before the reader will save them time looking them up. Given the nature of the topic of ethics, he relies heavily on the law, the prophets, and the book of Proverbs in particular. Apocalyptic texts receive less attention. The book was not written primarily for fellow scholars, but the author’s many other books would give fuller documentation and statements of his views for readers interested in going deeper. Although Goldingay focuses on the Old Testament, he often shows connections to the New Testament. Although the chapters are brief by design, Goldingay makes careful distinctions on key issues and offers helpful outlines. For instance, in the chapter on “Violence” (69–76), he presents an outline of five aspects to the Old Testament witness. Likewise, on the topic of “Nations” (152–58), he offers a nuanced

classification moving from kin-group to superpowers. The chapter on “Cities” (165–72) notes the negative and positive depictions of urban life in the Bible.

Although the book was written primarily for a lay audience, ministry students and professors could benefit from reading this book. In particular, the author’s communication skills are admirable, and his views could trigger fresh insights. A minister might use the book for personal study, and some of Goldingay’s insights might trigger sermon ideas. But the book could be useful in small group Bible studies as well. Each chapter concludes with questions for reflection and discussion. A group leader would need to be comfortable with an author that acknowledges the rough edges of Scripture and is willing to consider unpopular views on some controversial subjects. The book is not organized around traditional hot potato issues such as capital punishment, war, homosexuality, and abortion, but these are often noted briefly. In general, readers should be ready for a lively, thought-provoking experience when reading this work. Readers should be ready to be stretched and challenged by this engaging work.

- Warren McWilliams, *Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma (senior professor of theology, retired)*

***Southern Religion, Southern Culture: Essays Honoring Charles Reagan Wilson.* Edited by Darren E. Grem, Ted Ownby, and James G. Thomas, Jr. Jackson, MS: University of Mississippi, 2019. 144 pages. Hardcover, \$70.00.**

The editors of this work, all colleagues at the University of Mississippi, have collected a series of essays to honor the contribution of historian Charles Reagan Wilson to the field of southern history. The essays stemmed from the 2015 Porter Fortune History Symposium on Southern Religion and Southern Culture of the Center for the Study of Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi.

Wilson has taught history at the University of Mississippi for more than three decades and played a leading role in shaping the field of southern history and the interdisciplinary field of southern studies. His groundbreaking work, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865–1920* (University of Georgia Press, 1983), revealed how white southerners created a unique civil religion of the Lost Cause in the years after the war. In *Flashes of a Southern Spirit: Meanings of the Spirit in the U.S. South* (University of Georgia Press, 2011), Wilson demonstrated the great breadth of southern spiritualities, and particularly forms that transcend institutionalized religion. Wilson has persuasively argued that southerners embraced a series of quasi-religious icons, relics, and sacred ideas and spaces, that became central features of southern culture. The contributors draw on Wilson’s work and assess the interpretive power of his insights and methodology for the study of southern history.

In the introduction, Darren E. Grem argued that southerners were deeply religious but not only in the institutional manner that one initially assumes for the Bible Belt. Grem

revealed the “other South” and the alternative spirituality that characterize the region. He utilized Wilson’s insights on cultural relics and sacred items, which he illustrated most notably with Elvis and Elvis memorabilia. Although Elvis was a national and international figure, southerners liked to claim him for themselves.

Paul Harvey argued that southern culture was a paradox between puritanism and hedonism. Wilson explored this paradox of the southern spirit throughout his career and applied it to new areas of music, literature, and art. Harvey argued that the South’s religiousness included the conventional evangelical expression of Christianity but also an alternative culture of religiousness expressed in popular music and art. Harvey learned from Wilson to give due weight to the diversity of southern spirituality, ranging from Protestant orthodoxy to folk art and transcendental blues music.

Ryan L. Fletcher argued that southerners used institutional religion for political gain. In a narrow exploration of mid-nineteenth century Arkansas, Fletcher uncovered a battle for religious and political supremacy between low-church evangelicals and Episcopalians. Although evangelicals composed a majority of the population, Episcopalians labored tirelessly for an equal share of influence in the region. Fletcher argued that evangelicals used a pseudo-populism to their advantage but ultimately bolstered Episcopalians in the process. Fletcher was excessive in his criticism of evangelicals on account of what he deemed their insufficient efforts toward social justice. But ironically, the Episcopal church was the primary home of the planter elite who maintained the institution of perpetual human bondage.

Otis W. Pickett studied John Lafayette Girardeau, a lesser-known Presbyterian pastor in postbellum South Carolina. Pickett argued that Girardeau personified his own southern paradox by championing the civil religion of the Lost Cause while also defending black rights and racial integration. By defending black civil rights, Girardeau practically undermined the tenets of the Lost Cause, most notably white supremacy, but also capitulated to the reigning culture by glorifying the “southern way of life.” Pickett demonstrated the complexity of the southern mind and the competing ideologies that existed in the days leading up to Jim Crow.

Alicia Jackson explored denominational life for African-American Methodists in Mississippi and argued that they achieved autonomy from white Christians by building independent educational institutions. In the years following emancipation, white Christians remained accustomed to paternalistic relations with their black brethren, but the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church “pursued black autonomy and independence” when they founded Mississippi Industrial College in Holly Springs (68). Jackson offered a fascinating account but compared to the other chapters, she gave less attention to engaging Wilson’s ideas and legacy.

Randall Stephens argued that Holiness and Pentecostal Christians were maverick communicators. They propagated their hyper-spiritual message first in print literature then by radio and finally by television. Stephens convincingly argued that contrary to the common assertion that conservative religion was out of touch with modern society, Pentecostals proved their ability to innovate and appeal to modern people. They were masters of religious marketing. Stephens appealed to their zeal for evangelism as the source of their “innovative impulse” (81). He demonstrated that Christian televangelism began in the South and has continued to be a powerful source for popular religious communication.

Arthur Remillard explored Wilson’s theme of spirituality beyond formalized religion and argued that southerners made sports sacred and developed college athletics as a quasi-religious tool for cultivating institutional identity and loyalty. In the New South era, new ideas of health emerged alongside older ideas of manliness and valor. College athletics became a forum to demonstrate physical strength and prowess and benefit the institution by inspiring school spirit. Modern southerners do not have to be very thoughtful or culturally aware to see the religious overtones that became well established for college athletics, but Wilson has helped articulate the subtleties of worship that southerners apply to college sports.

Chad Seales explored a darker subject. Seales rightly argued that southerners adopted sacred relics from their Confederate past, but he also uncovered the disturbing practice of sacralizing lynching. Southerners embraced secular relics from the Civil War, including not only literal artifacts but also by becoming Civil War soldiers themselves as reenactors. But white southerners also gave religious overtones to the mob violence that preserved white supremacy. They applied Christian language to their murderous acts and even treasured physical relics from the scene like severed fingers from the victims. Seales proved that southern spirituality could be monstrously dark.

Ted Ownby concluded the volume and offered a masterful summary of Wilson’s contribution: his insights, methodology, and personal influence as a professor and speaker. Thankfully, Wilson’s work is not finished. Ownby notes that Wilson is currently completing a project on southern identity.

The editors have crafted a volume that coheres well. Each of the essays illumines Wilson’s influence on southern studies, even if sometimes indirectly, such as with Jackson’s chapter. The contributors offer their own specialized studies to illuminate the broad implications of Wilson’s ideas. He has helped historians better understand the complicated history of the American South and the fascinating culture of its people.

I recommend this book not only to academic historians but also to ministers who serve in a southern context. A pastor who studies history will better understand the people that he serves and the culture that he seeks to engage. The South is still the Bible Belt—for now—but the religious culture of the region is far more complex than one might initially expect.

- Paul Sanchez, *The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky*

***The Task of Dogmatics: Explorations in Theological Method.* Edited by Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2017. 249 pages. Paperback, \$29.99.**

*The Task of Dogmatics* is a compilation of eleven theological essays collected from the fifth annual Los Angeles Theology Conference in 2017. Each of the essays, edited by Oliver D. Crisp (PhD, King's College, London) and Fred Sanders (PhD, Graduate Theological Union), tries to answer the fundamental question, How can we examine methodology theologically? The editors cast the *causa sine qua non* over the whole argument as "faith seeks understanding" (17). In this review, I will offer a summary and evaluation of selected essays.

In the first chapter, Kevin J. Vanhoozer suggests an integration of analytic skills with poetic sensibilities as dogmatic discourse, "the ability conceptually to elaborate what is said and the ability imaginatively to feel the particular force with which it is said" (42). Vanhoozer also raises the mission of dogmatic statements, which is "to understand the mission of God, by implication, the mission of the church" (45). Ultimately, the major task of dogmatics serves Jesus Christ, who is the mission of God, and discloses the historical movement of the church by using both analytic and poetic methods.

Emphasizing the triune God's sharing of his bliss with his creatures through revelation, Scott R. Swain expresses dogmatics as systematic theology in chapter 2. He purposes to "commend a particular conception of dogmatic theology as theoretical, contemplative wisdom" by providing four theses (53). He claims that dogmatic theology is "mixed" by theoretical and practical discipline thanks to the grace of God, who revealed himself. Moreover, Swain adds that the contemplative aspect of dogmatic theology is closely related to systematic theology in knowing God (68).

In chapter 4, Chris Tilling, a New Testament scholar, explicates 1 Cor 8:1–7 concerning the task of dogmatics. By unfolding the narrative of the biblical text, he stresses that Paul's "necessary knowing" is not a possession by which the Corinthians claim to be "knowledgeable," but concerns God's knowledge of his people in relation to covenant relationship and is the "epistemological and hermeneutical key" to Paul's argument (92). Tilling avers that Paul asserts the true nature of theological knowledge comes through a true "relationship," and that is why it is precarious for abstract conceptualities to condition language about God. Tilling, therefore, proposes that the task of dogmatics is related to Paul's relational, epistemological tendencies.

Henri Blocher begins chapter 5 with a question, "How can we speak of the truth of an explanation if significations are contextual?" Then, he explains, "Contextual implies specific times and places" (108). Blocher provides two pillars to frame the issue, permanent validity and contextual relativity. Blocher justifies contextual relativity by noting scriptural instances, for example, ordinances like sacrifices and marriage in the patriarchal age, which are not valid after Moses (110–13). However, contextualization could never be the concept for the biblically unique event of the incarnation (117). In the end, Blocher argues that

Christian doctrines continue because of their transcendent source in divine revelation and the unity of creation.

In chapter 6, Katherine Sonderegger discusses Holy Scripture as sacred ground. She summarizes her claim, “The Bible is a Book like no other—stands as my strongest conviction about Holy Scripture as Sacred Ground of theology” (132). Sonderegger claims that Holy Scripture is not an object to compare to other historical, moral, or sacred texts because it is perfect, holy, utterly alone, sovereign, and majestic (137). Holy Scripture is the source of theological authority in dogmatics not because the Scripture contains the contents, events, and narrative stories but because the Scripture is the only locus for Christians to experience the holy God’s presence. The uniqueness of Scripture is the sacred ground of dogmatics.

Darren Sumner, asserting that method includes the ability to undertake the work, tries to identify theology’s pattern and norm in chapter 7. The critical questions are, “What are the theologian’s sources and norms? Which doctrine or doctrines are wisely given priority over others, so that the decisions one makes with regard to the center of dogmatics benefits the whole?” (145). Sumner suggests two proposals, Karl Barth’s Christocentric method and John Webster’s doctrine of the Trinity, especially the immanent Trinity (145). Barth and Webster have similar motivations. Barth appeals to Christ to make anthropology obsolete, while Webster argues for theology to incapacitate naturalism (154). Sumner claims that the doctrine of the Trinity is the starting point so that dogmatics begins from God and God’s works.

James M. Arcadi proffers a constructive proposal in response to the question, What is the dogmatic task? He challenges Barth’s consideration that the Word of God makes talk about God found in the church’s proclamation true (162–63). Arcadi argues against Barth’s conception of church proclamation—which is “primarily and decisively preaching and the sacraments”—by giving a conception of dogma. “Dogma means the free, revealing, reconciling, addressing act of Jesus Christ directed to specific individual humans. And the dogmatic task is to discern those instances of success or failure, when dogma does or does not obtain” (164, 173). Ultimately, dogma and dogmatic task are not limited to preaching and the sacraments. Instead, all kinds of communication to God and worship deserve to be called dogma (177).

A strength of this book comes with the conception of theology itself. Each of the essays seems to take its own direction regardless of the overall connection; however, all essays focus on theology, not anthropology. As mentioned in the editorial introduction, formal and substantive do not have to be distinguished in theological method. Dogmatics need not be constructed by the framework under the name of methodology; rather, theology is pervasive in every path of the work. Formal and substantive come together. The main stream of this book supports this idea because all essays in which Webster’s doctrine of the Trinity and his theological direction affect the thoughts and ideas give one stream of

flow in the dogmatic task. This work on theological method is highly recommended for theologians, pastors, and seminary students.

- Wang Yong Lee, *Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas*

***Teaching the World: Foundations for Online Theological Education.* By John Cartwright, Gabriel Etzel, Christopher Jackson, and Timothy Paul Jones. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2017. 185 pages. Paperback, 24.99.**

John Cartwright, Gabriel Etzel, Christopher Jackson, and Timothy Paul Jones have used their experience and background to discuss the value and biblical foundation of online theological higher education and provide insight into better teaching practices. John Cartwright is the associate dean of the School of Divinity at Liberty University. Gabriel Etzel is the administrative dean of the School of Divinity at Liberty University and also professor of theology and leadership. Christopher Jackson is pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church in Algoma, Wisconsin, and Timothy Paul Jones is the C. Edwin Gheens Professor of Christian Family Ministry and the associate vice president for the Global Campus at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. These four ministers, professors, and administrators have collaborated to provide a picture of how online studies fit within the full spectrum of theological higher education.

The purpose of this work is to provide a clear theological foundation for online theological education and to remind educators that the purpose of theological education is spiritual transformation regardless of the medium. The book begins with a chapter on the past patterns and current challenges in online theological education. The authors explain that the current online education system is the culmination of distance learning over the years from traditional correspondence courses requiring snail-mail submission of assignments to courses involving learning supplemented by various forms of media. One question that often plagues administrators is whether "online courses are a suitable medium for the training of God-called ministers" (10). Answering this question in the affirmative is the main focus of the book. This introductory chapter proposes a move beyond the pragmatics of online education—"recruitment, retention, and the pursuit of profitability" (11)—and instead exhorts administrators and professors to view online education as more than "bare transfer of theological education" (11) and instead to view its potential as a training tool for spiritual formation.

The following nine chapters are divided into three sections. The first section provides "Better Foundations for Online Learning," which overviews support for and against online education. Chapter 2 compares online education to Paul's epistolary theory and practice. Paul's use of epistles to provide theological education and training to churches is comparable to online education because "they are both means of theological education. They are both done from a physical distance. The local congregation is a significant focus in both formats. Both have certain advantages and disadvantages as a means of communication" (29). Chapter 3 provides implications for online theological education based on Paul's epistolary

theory and practice. Some of the implications include encouraging professors to make a stronger effort to establish presence with their online community of students; fostering intimacy and transparency within the online course (46); and noting the benefits of online discussion boards for “more thoughtful interaction” (48). Chapter 4 overviews some of the recent literature on online education and examines the support and criticisms leveled against it, noting the critic Paul House of Beeson Divinity School who “contends that online theological education is inappropriate principally because the Scriptures commend face-to-face, intimate educational experiences” (57). The authors give consideration to House’s perspective but also provide significant evidence against it.

Connecting online education with Paul’s use of epistolary teaching gives legitimacy to the benefit of distance teaching and its use for spiritual formation. The authors did a thorough study of epistolary theory and practice in the first century. However, even within their defense of online theological education, they concede that “Pauline epistolary theory and practice suggest that traditional, face-to-face formats should hold a primary place in theological education” (45).

The authors provide detailed biblical support for their studies through use of footnotes, but they, at times, make statements without support. For instance, the authors claim that Paul “acknowledged that the epistle could be a better means of communication than his personal presence in some circumstances” (28), but they fail to support that statement. In another instance, they state that “Paul believed in the importance of personally relating to his congregations” (46) without specific biblical support. Also, their study of Paul’s letters lacks E. Randolph Richards’s seminal work *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing*, which would have confirmed further their defense of epistolary theory as relevant to distance education.

Section 2 discusses “Better Faculty for Online Learning.” Chapters 5–7 examine the faculty member’s relationship to the student and the spiritual formation that should be taking place within the lives of both. The authors state, “The educator must prioritize student formation over the transferring of information” (84). The focus on spiritual formation of both faculty member and student is relevant both to on-campus and online students. In this section, the authors encourage administrators to hire faculty who have been transformed and to make continuing spiritual transformation of online faculty a priority. The method of engaging students in spiritual transformation involves the professor becoming “a model to follow” rather than a “sage on the stage” or “guide on the side” (100).

The focus in this section on engaging students in spiritual transformation and continuing that transformation among faculty is a helpful reminder that theological education in general is not merely transferal of information. However, this section lacks specific examples for online faculty members to follow, especially when accreditation rules may prevent professors from the freedom to create online learning environments that

foster openness and community. The encouragement, though, to see students beyond their e-mail address and to make a more concerted effort to get to know students is a needed reminder that should be encouraged of all faculty each semester.

The final section focuses on “Better Practices in the Classroom.” In these three chapters, Cartwright presents a portrait of the online student and why the need for online education exists. He also incorporates typical best practices within an online course and applies adult learning theory to the practice of online education. Most seasoned online instructors will not find much information here surprising. Much of the information in these three chapters is helpful for instructors to consider, but it applies more to the administration and to the course builder because it relates to hiring practices and to the setup of the course, which is an area where most online instructors do not have input.

The approach of this work examines an aspect of online education not previously discussed. For the most part, online education has been considered merely a means of meeting student need or a survival mechanism to transition universities and seminaries into the next generation. Online education is a newer development and sometimes looked down upon by brick and mortar professors. The authors, however, give a picture of a segment of education that is valuable and a legitimate part of theological education if professors are engaged with their students and with God as part of the transforming process. The authors of this book not only put forth the value of online theological education but maintain that spiritual transformation is not only possible but a necessary component of online education that must be incorporated into the professor’s attitude in teaching the online course.

- *Karla Ra, online instructor for LeTourneau University and California Baptist University*

***Zondervan Handbook of Biblical Archaeology.* By Randall Price with H. Wayne House. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2017. 408 pages. Hardcover, \$42.99.**

The *Zondervan Handbook of Biblical Archaeology* is “a book by book guide to archaeological discoveries related to the Bible” (front cover). The purpose of the book is to render the archaeological data accessible to the reader to aid in his or her study of the Bible. The primary author, Randall Price (PhD, University of Texas), is Distinguished Research Professor of Biblical and Judaic Studies in the School of Divinity at Liberty University and has participated in several archaeological digs as well as written other books on the subject. While the authors do not believe that archaeology proves the Bible to be true, they do believe that it affirms the historical accuracy of the biblical narratives (15–16). The need for verification is important for academic discussions, theological studies, and for personal growth.

The book begins with a concise introduction to biblical archaeology, including a historical overview and discussions of its methodology, contribution, and limitations. For those familiar with the subject, this may serve as a refresher. For those unfamiliar, this will be a helpful initiation. The bulk of the book is divided into four parts: Archaeology of the

---

OT, Archaeology of the Intertestamental Period, Archaeology of the NT, and appendices which include maps, a glossary, and indices.

The biblical sections walk through the biblical books in canonical order, engaging relevant archaeological discoveries and their significance for the biblical narratives. Each chapter is tailored to reflect the interests of that biblical book. For example, Genesis deals with myths as potential backgrounds and the historical validity of the patriarchs, whereas 1 and 2 Samuel focus on the evidence for the kingdoms of David and Solomon. While these discussions include more popular issues such as the dating of the exodus (82–83), they also have discussions on more nuanced issues. For example, there is an entire section on the domestication of the camel (77–80). Although the camel may seem like a trivial issue, it is essential to the historical dating of the patriarchal narratives.

The section on the Intertestamental Period is brief. It only discusses the Second Temple (both Zerubbabel and Herod) and the Dead Sea Scrolls. These are important issues and should be discussed. However, it leaves the reader wondering if more could not be included about this period.

There is a noticeable shift in the presentation of the New Testament due to the nature and quantity of the material. The discussions proceed in canonical order, as with the Old Testament. However, while the Old Testament focuses on monuments and tablets, the New Testament concentrates on locations (e.g., Bethlehem, Jericho, and Caesarea Maritima), people (e.g., Pontius Pilate and Sergius Paulus), and inscriptions. They are all accompanied by discussions explaining their relevance for biblical study. For example, there is a section on the archaeological evidence for proconsul Gallio and his significance in the book of Acts (301–03).

The book features color pictures and descriptions of artifacts (e.g., the Merneptah Stele and the Jerusalem Prism), charts, and pictures of sites. At the end of the book, there is a section of maps and a glossary defining technical terms. There are also Scripture and subject indices for easy referencing. All of these features enhance the book's aesthetic and make it reader-friendly.

This book is perhaps best understood as a survey of the archaeological data about biblical backgrounds. The material is beautifully presented and easy to navigate. This book would be a helpful addition to anyone interested in learning more about the backgrounds of the Bible, whether they are a novice seeking a basic introduction or someone looking for an accessible reference work. This reflects the book's flexibility for personal study or a classroom setting. The book would serve nicely as a supplement to an OT or NT survey or as an introductory work on biblical backgrounds or archaeology.

This book is not a substitute for a backgrounds course, and it is not exhaustive. It neither addresses every issue nor addresses each issue thoroughly. However, it does survey an impressive variety of topics and material. The discussions provided are informative, with most including citations. Readers will be adequately versed in the areas of archaeological dispute. Also, the book provides endnotes and a bibliography for further research. Additionally, the book attempts to be unbiased about the biblical data. The authors show their hand when they admit that they believe the biblical narrative (which should not surprise their intended audience). Otherwise, their argumentation is fairly impartial. For example, they present the evidence for the different dating of the patriarchs (74–81) and the exodus event (82–85). The point is not to prove their position but to inform readers and allow them to make their own decision on those matters.

Backgrounds has become an essential component of biblical studies, informing students about the world of the biblical narratives and grounding text in history. Works such as the *Zondervan Handbook of Biblical Archaeology* are a welcome and increasingly necessary resource. This work is attractive, covering the biblical and intertestamental periods. It divides the material in a book-by-book format to help the reader associate the material with the biblical narrative. Also, many pictures and aids orient readers.

This book is a reference work, but it can be utilized in two ways. First, it can be used to convey content. For example, someone interested in the Cyrus Cylinder can read the relevant section (165–67). Second, it informs the reader about areas of historical debate. For example, some readers may not be aware that the date and historicity of the exodus are debated. This book briefly walks through the discussion, explaining both sides (late vs. early date). This work would be beneficial for pastors and laypeople who want a comprehensive introduction to the world of biblical archaeology. However, this work could be just as useful for students who would benefit from its breadth of discussions and bibliography.

- James W. Knox, Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas

A man in a dark suit and purple tie is speaking in a classroom. He is gesturing with his hands. In the background, several students are seated at desks, some with laptops open. The overall scene is a professional academic setting.

# GO DEEP

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY



**NEW ORLEANS**  
BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
ANSWERING GOD'S CALL

- Residential study in New Orleans
- Non-residential study through block and synchronous video formats

[NOBTS.EDU/RESEARCH](http://NOBTS.EDU/RESEARCH)



# DEFEND THE FAITH

An Apologetics Conference  
Hosted by NOBTS

January 6-10, 2020  
New Orleans, LA



Alister  
McGrath



John  
Lennox



Frank  
Turek



Gary  
Habermas



Jamie  
Dew

<http://nobtsapologetics.com/defend/>

and many more