



The possibilities this approach raises are quite exciting. On the one hand, Moffitt's work clearly distinguishes between penal/judicial and cultic/sacrificial aspects of the atonement, allowing each to play their appropriate role within the doctrine. This makes for rich possibilities as we re-engage the sacrificial material throughout Scripture, without burdening it with largely foreign penal/judicial motifs and categories. On the other, this contributes to an emphasis on the divine holiness within theological studies. God is a holy God, and we, in our sin, are impure, unclean. To delve into the meaning of these claims is an exciting endeavour, which I find to have been underdeveloped in recent thought.

My frustration with the book is one that I tend to have with biblical studies generally, which is to say that it is a fruitful and generative frustration: Moffitt consistently takes us right up to the point of making claims about who God is, how he acts in Christ, about his holiness and his purifying work – and then stops short of delving into the meaning of these claims. This book makes me all the more eager to understand the holiness of God – in fact, it demands that I engage in such study, for Moffitt shows again and again how the biblical reflection on the work of Christ demands such a pattern of thought. But Moffitt himself shies away from the kind of reflection I would like to see. Several paths come to mind here, including studies of God's holiness by John Webster and Mark C. Murphy, and P.T. Forsyth's studies of the atonement. Many such studies revolve around the doctrine of holiness, or theological developments of the doctrine of the ascension, which come at the same material Moffitt considers, but from another more theological angle, such as the works of Andrew Burgess and Douglas Farrow.

But the tension is a fruitful one. Moffitt's goal is to mine the biblical text (Hebrews in particular) for patterns of thought honouring Scripture's integration of the work of Christ and the sacrificial system in ways that demand a series of rich and fascinating modifications to common understandings of the atonement. But to my encouragement, these modifications come, according to Moffitt, in a manner complimentary to and expansive of other aspects of the work of Christ.

doi:10.1017/S0036930623000248

## **William G. Witt and Joel Scandrett, *Mapping Atonement: The Doctrine of Reconciliation in Christian History and Theology***

**(Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2022), pp. xii + 240. \$27.99**

Oliver D. Crisp

St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, Fife, UK ([odc@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:odc@st-andrews.ac.uk))

The atonement is a topic of considerable theological interest at present. It has been for some time. *Mapping Atonement* is an addition to the secondary literature that attempts to give an historical and theological overview of the doctrine. It is clearly written,

engaging and focuses on close readings of primary texts in translation. Witt and Scandrett cover some of the best-known models of atonement, including the incarnational view of Irenaeus and Athanasius, *Christus Victor* in Gustaf Aulén's work, Anselmian satisfaction, the 'divine love' view of Abelard and the Wesleys, 'fittingness' in Aquinas, penal substitution in Calvin and Charles Hodge, moral exemplarism in Hastings Rashdall and atonement as reconciliation in Barth. The final chapter, which attempts to bring the discussion up to date, considers some recent evangelical proposals and then discusses the work of Thomas Torrance, ending with some reflections on central issues in atonement theology.

The authors are to be commended for their careful, nuanced treatments of the various theological positions they discuss. Eschewing caricatures which bedevil much popular atonement theology, they consistently point to the complexity of the views upon which they focus. Patristic theology is not all about *Christus Victor*; Anselm is not a flat-footed medieval; Abelard is not a mere moral exemplarist; Aquinas has a rounded doctrine of atonement not just a milder version of satisfaction; Calvin's doctrine is multifaceted (though Hodge is rather baldly forensic); Rashdall's views are of a piece with his liberal Anglicanism and idealist philosophy; and Barth's doctrine in *Church Dogmatics* IV/1 is a kind of masterclass in how to think about the shape of atonement theology. Torrance too, comes in for praise for his handling of reconciliation in holistic terms. This is all to the good and will commend the book to professors and tutors teaching classes on atonement theology.

Naturally, there are questions that could be raised regarding the particular doctrines covered. For instance, in chapter 6 the authors begin by distinguishing penal substitution from satisfaction – but as versions of broadly the same sort of atonement doctrine. This is surely a mistake. As they make clear, the mechanism for atonement in satisfaction is Christ's merit, *not* punishment, whereas in penal substitution it *is* (at least, classically) punishment. It is odd to think that satisfaction and penal substitution are versions of the same doctrine if they are distinguished by incommensurate means of atonement.

A second issue concerns the distinction between constitutive and illustrative models of atonement – a recurring theme in the book. According to constitutive models, Christ's work somehow effects reconciliation with God. According to illustrative models Christ's work illustrates salvation already available. Moral exemplarism is the paradigm of this latter approach. But, as the authors conclude at the end of chapter 7, in the case of Rashdall's view atonement drops out of the discussion altogether because Christ's work does nothing to bring about human reconciliation with God. Thus, somewhat paradoxically, the paradigm of illustrative models of atonement is not a model of atonement at all. It seems to me that this is true of Rashdall's account. But it is not true of moral exemplarism *as such*, at least some versions of which do amount to atonement doctrines.

A third concern is that aside from passing remarks about 'cosmic child abuse', there is no serious engagement with worries about divine violence raised since the 1980s by feminist, Mennonite, and Girardian theologians. Given the importance of these issues in the recent atonement literature, this seems like a significant omission.

This brings me to the question of the treatment of atonement theology of the last thirty or more years. If this work had been billed as a textbook in atonement theology to the middle of the twentieth century, there would be little to complain about. But the discussion in the final chapter is odd. The focus on the controversial work *Pierced for Our Transgressions* is strange because it perpetrates some of the caricatures about the

pre-eminence of penal substitution that the authors seek to avoid. Joel Green and Mark Baker's *Recovering the Scandal of the Cross* is a more important book, but the first edition dates from 2000 – more than twenty years ago. Tom Wright's *The Day the Revolution Began* is a fairly recent publication (2016), but it is also a more popular treatment of the topic. By contrast, the works that have had the most impact in the past fifty years are passed over in silence. (Here I am thinking of contributions by the likes of Jürgen Moltmann, Joanna Carlson Brown and Rebecca Parker, Colin Gunton, Kathryn Tanner, Eleonore Stump and of biblical scholars like Michael Gorman and David Moffitt.)

No one textbook can cover all the bases, and this work does a good job of providing readers with an overview of many of the most important historic accounts of atonement up to the twentieth century. I certainly profited by reading it and will recommend to students that they consult it – perhaps before reading some more recent work on the topic.

doi:10.1017/S0036930623000121

## **Aaron P. Edwards, *Taking Kierkegaard Back to Church: The Ecclesial Implications of the Gospel***

**(Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2022), pp. xiii + 195. £21.00/\$26.00**

Carl S. Hughes

Texas Lutheran University, Seguin, TX, USA ([chughes@tlu.edu](mailto:chughes@tlu.edu))

To seek the 'ecclesial implications of the gospel' in a figure who did not attend church for the last four years of his life, described the church as a hospital slowly poisoning its patients, compared the clergy to cannibals living off the flesh of true Christians, and refused to take communion on his death bed is a bold project. Yet Edwards reminds us that Kierkegaard had seminary training in practical theology, came close to ordination more than once, and wrote nearly half of his writings in the form of sermons (some of which he actually preached). In this book, he reads the former dimension of Kierkegaard through the prism of the latter. He even tries to imagine 'what a Kierkegaardian pastorate might have looked like' (p. xii). The book offers a resolutely theological reading of Kierkegaard as well as a practical application of his thought to Christian life today.

The book's scope is at once historical, exegetical and constructive. It contextualises Kierkegaard in relationship to Luther and Calvin and Barth, exposit his views on a range of theological topics, and enlists him in attacks on relativism, postmodernism and other tendencies the author perceives as threats to the church today. Edwards identifies as an Evangelical Christian and is committed to a high view of scriptural authority, an emphasis on individual guilt and forgiveness and a lived affiliation with the church. At times, it is difficult to distinguish the author's own views from those he attributes to Kierkegaard. Although Kierkegaard rarely, if ever, speaks in any of these terms, Edwards assures us of Kierkegaard's belief in the unity and perspicuity