

## [Post-Calvinism: Trinity Student Days](#)

Filed under: [Post-Calvinism](#) — Scot McKnight @ 9:10 am

When I got to Trinity in the Fall of 1976, the first thing I noticed was how tightly the theological discussion was ratcheted. These folks knew what they were talking about, and they knew biblical texts and theological discussions, and the history of the Church. It took some work just to be conversant. It was a challenge for which I am grateful to this day.

Calvinism was not a front-burner issue, but was on the stove top waiting for someone to say something uninformed. I had some wonderful lecturers: H. Dermott McDonald was an eccentric theologian from London who told us that our syllabus was the library and we should get over there and read up on “God, Man, and Christ” and then come take his exam at the end. David Wells taught Sin and Salvation, and began by telling us that his wife said that he could teach the first half of the class by giving an autobiography. McDonald was not a Calvinist; Wells was. My NT teachers didn’t raise such topics: Norm Ericson and Murray Harris. But, then Grant Osborne came to TEDS. (So, I can blame this journey on Grant, which he’d be happy to take credit for.)

Here’s what happened. Grant is famous for his handouts, and he had one on Eternal Security. It was a lengthy handout and he asked me to work through it, add some bibliography, and generally re-write it. It was a big task for me, but it was the first real chance I had to do something at that level. To prepare for it, Grant suggested I read I. Howard Marshall, [Kept by the Power of God](#). Which I did. From cover to cover; underlined it; took notes; checked commentaries. It took a good long while. When I came up for air in Hebrews I had been persuaded that I was wrong about Calvinism. Like C.S. Lewis getting on a bus and then getting off converted, but not knowing when or how, so with me: from the beginning of working through Grant’s notes to reading through Marshall and arguing with him until he wrestled me to the ground and pinned me, I had become convinced that I was no longer a Calvinist. Which didn’t mean I gave up the *architecture* of Calvinism, but I did its theology.

It was and still is my conviction that the five points belong together. You might be able to give up #5 somehow (I don’t think so, but some think so) and you might need to add a #6 (Responsibility), but if the Arminian understanding of “losing salvation” is right, then Calvinism is not right. (I’ll eventually show why I don’t like the expression “losing salvation.”) Let me say this more clearly: if God’s grace can be resisted somehow, if believers can somehow choose to forfeit their salvation, then unconditional election and irresistible grace (and probably limited atonement) and surely perseverance/preservation of the saints are not right.

I found two major weaknesses in Calvinism’s theology (and also a disorientation in its architecture): first, the *emphasis* of its architecture is not the emphasis of the Bible. Its focus on God’s Sovereignty, which very quickly becomes much less a doctrine of grace than a doctrine of control and theodicy etc, and its overemphasis on human depravity are not the emphases I found in the Bible. I do not dispute the presence of these themes; I dispute this is where the gravity of emphasis is found in the Bible. Yes, I know we all have metanarratives that put things together, and Calvinism is one such metanarrative. It works for some; it simply didn’t work for me.

Second, the *exegetis* of Calvinism on crucial passages I found wanting and sometimes dead wrong. I was once standing, years later when I was teaching at Trinity, outside my door talking with two professors about my view of Hebrews, when I simply asked one of them, “Who do you think best answers the Arminian interpretation of Hebrews?” That professor said, “Philip Hughes.” I had just read Hughes and I thought it was weak. In fact, what I thought was this: “If that is the best, then there is no debate.” The other professor said, “I agree, Scot. Hughes doesn’t answer the questions.” Then he said, “I’m not sure any commentary really answers it well.” (Both of these professors were Calvinists, and still are, God bless ‘em.) What I’m saying is that exegetical conclusions I was drawing (in all kinds of passages) were not answered adequately by the Calvinists I was reading. I think I gave them a fair shot.

So this is where I found myself when I left for Nottingham to study for a Ph.D. in New Testament. I was reared among the eternal security Baptists who took what they liked from Calvinism and discarded most of the five points. Then I became more consistently Calvinistic by reading the Puritans and Calvin.

Then I read the Bible from a different point of view and it all came tumbling down. If the Bible, so I concluded, teaches that a human can be a believer and somehow forfeit that status, then the theology of Calvinism cannot be right.

This left me with a strange mixture of theology: I was reared Baptist; I had done more than my fair share of reading the low church Anabaptists and considered myself one of those when it came to where theologizing ought to begin: with Jesus. And I was now studying the Bible with some Arminian conclusions on soteriology.

Following two years in England TEDS offered me a non-tenure track job to teach NT that lasted two years, and then (by the grace of God) it was ramped up to a full-time position when Wayne Grudem, in the providence of God, shifted over to Systematic Theology.

Within two years I was asked to teach Hebrews in a survey course, and I decided to spend my entire summer going through the exegesis of Hebrews and I was determined to concentrate on those dadgummed warning passages to see if I could settle the issues once and for all.

If I’m right about Hebrews, Calvinism is wrong. The number of students who wrote midterm essays agreeing with me made me nervous. It was no coincidence that a well-known Calvinistic prof, whom I often called “DA what’s his name?” in class, began teaching Hebrews shortly thereafter.

Tomorrow I’ll start on the warning passages in Hebrews, the most notorious of which is Hebrews 6:4-6. I think I can prove that the author believed “believers” could forfeit their salvation.

**JULY 29, 2005**

[Post-Calvinism: Trinity Lectures](#)

Filed under: [Post-Calvinism](#) — Scot McKnight @ 8:09 pm

One of the courses I taught at Trinity, NT 612, included a survey of the book of Hebrews. And, once or twice I taught Advanced Exegesis and we marched through the entirety of the Greek text of Hebrews. The courses energized me deeply, and I must say that by and large the students were alert to the significance of the topics we were discussing. (Not that they stayed alert when we talked about Melchizedek.)

One of the focal points of my lectures was the Warning Passages. There are five of these. I'd like to copy them all into this post but it would take up too much space. Here are the passages:

1. Hebrews 2:1-4
2. Hebrews 3:7-4:13
3. Hebrews 5:11-6:12
4. Hebrews 10:19-39
5. Hebrews 12:1-29

Of these, #3 gets all the attention, and especially 6:4-6, which follows:

4 For it is impossible to restore again to repentance those who have once been enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and have shared in the Holy Spirit, 5 and have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come, 6 and then have fallen away, since on their own they are crucifying again the Son of God and are holding him up to contempt.

These verses deserve all the attention they get, but the others deserve more than they are getting. It is standard for most Bible readers to find in Hebrews 6:6 ("and then have fallen away") a bewildering sense that this text seems to suggest they can lose their faith, fall away, and never be restored to repentance, and that means bad things. Most respond by dissecting this text carefully, isolating each expression, wondering if maybe it is not as bothersome as it really sounds, and end up (in many cases) walking away convinced this text doesn't actually teach that a believer can "lose his or her salvation."

I make in a journal article I wrote in 1992 two proposals, and I want to work these out with you to see what you think of my suggestions.

But, back to my class: what I thought I would do is present as clearly as possible an alternative understanding of the Warning Passages in Hebrews. To do this, I spent hours and hours working on these passages in their contexts and then finding my way through them.

So, in that class I suggested that we look together at two proposals: first, that we consider looking at the Warning Passages *as a whole*. That is, read each one in context but also compare them together as doing largely the same things. This would allow us to synthesize these passages into a meaningful whole. Second, I discovered when we do this that we find *four features in each Warning Passage*.

Here's what I found and what I told that class (and each one after that). Each passage has:

1. The *audience* or the subjects: who is being addressed? What does the author call them?

2. The *sin* the author warns this audience about: what is it that he think they may be doing?
3. The *exhortation* the author gives each time: what are they to do instead of the sin?
4. The *consequences* the author spells out if they don't respond to his exhortation: what will happen if they don't respond properly?

Here's what happened in those classes: by and large students agreed with the conclusions we drew for each part of the Warning Passages. Now, as you know, my conclusions were that the author warned the audience of apostasy and warned them that they would forfeit their salvation. What surprised me is the number of students who agreed with me. After all, these were true-blue conservative evangelical types who by and large believed in eternal security and assurance of salvation and these sorts of ideas.

I'll do what I can to get to the specifics tomorrow, but we will be gone much of the day. I will begin with #4 and work my way up that list.

For now, may I challenge you to read those texts and think about those four categories for each Warning Passage.

**JULY 30, 2005**

[Post-Calvinism: Consequences](#)

Filed under: [Post-Calvinism](#) — Scot McKnight @ 7:35 pm

I am reflecting here in a series of posts on how "I changed my mind" about Calvinism and adopted a more Ariminian view of whether or not the Christian can throw away redemption.

This journey took through the book of Hebrews, where I suggested we can find four elements to each Warning Passage. Today I want to look briefly at the fourth element, the *consequences*. Very few will disagree with this (I hope).

The first comment is in Heb 2:2: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation?" The implied answer is "There is no way of escape."

Here are some more to consider:

3:11: They will not enter my rest.

6:4-6: It is impossible to renew them unto repentance (cf. 12:16-17).

10:26: no sacrifice for sins remains.

10:27: but only a fearful expectation of judgment and of raging fire that will consume the enemies of God.

10:28: died without mercy.

10:30-31: And again, "The Lord will judge his people." 31 It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

10:39: destruction.

If we accept the proposal that the Warning Passages are dealing with the same subjects, etc., then we can synthesize this evidence into this conclusion: the author of Hebrews warns a specific group of people about some sin and tells them that if they commit that sin they will find themselves outside the company of God. They will be diminished.

Not let us say what the text says: here is an extreme warning about dire consequences in eternity.

Plenty of room here for theological debate: what Hebrews says is consistent with both the traditional/orthodox view of eternal separation from God as well as the more recent views of some British Evangelicals on annihilationism. For that matter, I'm sure my Roman Catholic theological friends would tell me this is also consistent with purgatory. We'll drop that for now (someday, though). The warning of Hebrews is extreme. This isn't about a breakdown of fellowship but about the great divorce.

Tomorrow, a blog on the exhortation the author gives to his audience.

### [Post-Calvinism: Exhortation](#)

Filed under: [Post-Calvinism](#) — Scot McKnight @ 7:43 am

The Warning Passages of Hebrews, which have vexed both ordinary Christians and professional scholars for centuries, have four elements: the audience, the sin, the exhortation, and the consequences. Our blog today will look at the exhortation. In my own journey, this topic was more critical than I realized, and it is more important than many seem to think. Perseverance is the issue.

Here are some terms the author uses for what he expects his audience to do instead of falling away:

- 2:1: pay attention
- 3:6, 14; 10:23: hold on
- 3:13: encourage one another
- 4:1: let us fear
- 4:11: let us strive hard
- 4:14: let us hold fast
- 6:1: let us carry on to perfection
- 10:35: do not cast away your confidence
- 10:36: you need perseverance
- 12:1: let us run with perseverance
- 12:7: endure hardship
- 12:12: strengthen your feeble arms and weak knees
- 12:15: see to it that no one misses the grace of God
- 12:25: see to it that you do not refuse

If we chose one term to put this all into one it would be either “perseverance” or “faithfulness.” This is both mental and personal: one both knows that God is faithful and one actively surrenders to God's grace and empowerment.

Both Calvinists and Arminians agree on this point: each person needs to persevere. The oddest thing has happened in American Evangelicalism: it has taught, whether aloud or not, the idea of “once saved, always saved” as if perseverance were not needed. In other words, it has taught that if a person has crossed the threshold but then decides to abandon living for Christ, that person is eternally secure. This is rubbish. Perseverance is an indicator of what faith is all about: a relationship that continues, that is marked by steady love. No one equates marriage with a wedding day statement of intent, and no one should equate faith with a decision.

What does it mean to persevere? It means that we continue to believe, that we live like it. It doesn't mean sinlessness; it doesn't mean that we are some steady incline into sanctification; it does not deny stumbling or messy spirituality. It doesn't deny doubt and problems. It simply means that the person continues to walk with Jesus and doesn't walk away from him.

Our next two blogs are big ones: what is the sin and who is the audience?

**AUGUST 1, 2005**

### [Post-Calvinism: Sin](#)

Filed under: [Post-Calvinism](#) — Scot McKnight @ 2:44 pm

The issues in the *Warning Passages* in Hebrews eventually come down to (1) what the sin is that the author is so concerned about and (2) who the audience is. In this post, I'll look at the *sin* that concerns him.

We all agree (generally) with the consequences spelled out and the exhortation to perseverance. But, the sin is not as susceptible to agreement.

When I lectured on these passages, I found most students did agree with me on this. I can also say that the issue of the nature of this *sin* vexed me and it vexes many others.

The list of the words the author uses for this sin in the Warning Passages is long, and I want to give a pretty complete listing just to be fair to the text and so we can have a better view of what we are trying to grapple with.

2:1: slip away  
2:2: violation  
2:2: disobedience  
2:3: disregard one's salvation  
3:8: harden your hearts  
3:8: rebellion  
3:8-9: test  
3:10: wander  
3:10: did not know my ways  
3:12: sinful, unbelieving heart  
3:12: turning away from the living God  
3:16: embitter

3:17: sin  
3:18: disobey  
4:1: fall short  
4:2: was of no value... did not combine it with faith  
4:11: fall  
6:6: fall away  
6:6: recrucify Christ.. making a public display of him  
5:11: sluggish  
10:25: not meeting together  
10:26: deliberate sin (cf. Num 15:22-31)  
10:27: enemies of God  
10:28: reject  
10:29: trample the Son of God  
10:29: regard the blood as common  
10:29: treat with the contempt the Spirit of grace  
10:35: throw away confidence  
10:39: shrink back  
12:1: sin that entangles (? is this part of it — not sure)  
12:3: not be wearied; lose heart  
12:5: forgotten the word of encouragement  
12:15: miss the grace of God  
12:15: bitter root (?)  
12:25: refuse the One who speaks  
12:25: turn away from

An imposing list, to be sure. We should observe that the author chose to avoid a single term for this sin. Some of these terms are more metaphorical than others, but when we study them fairly I think we can say this:

The sin the author is warning about is a willful rejection of the triune God — Father, Son, and Spirit — and an open denunciation of this God’s moral standards. This sin is *deliberate*. (It does not grab the person when the person is not expecting it.) Second, it is *Trinitarian*. Third, it is *moral in manifestation*.

(For many, this sin is return to Judaism. There is precious little evidence for this, and many are wisely saying today that the author is concerned with *whom they are leaving* not *where they are headed*.)

The term I prefer for this sin in Hebrews is *apostasy*. This is a sin committed by those who are Christians — and tomorrow I’ll blog on what that might mean. This sin is abandoning the Christian faith, abandoning active trust in Jesus Christ, etc.. I am impressed (exegetically, not morally) by 10:29: these people “mock” (*hybris* is a good translation here) Christ. This is not about those who “wonder” if they’ve committed this sin; this is something these folks know they have done and are proud of it.

In sum, again, a synthesis of the Warning Passages yields light on understanding the issue.

Will it help us understand the Audience? I think so. It was this issue and my students' response to it that most surprised me.

### [Post-Calvinism: Believers or Not?](#)

Filed under: [Post-Calvinism](#) — Scot McKnight @ 7:43 am

Everything about the *Warning Passages* in Hebrews hinges upon the audience: Who are they? Are they believers or not?

I begin with this observation: in the history of the Church many have made a distinction between a genuine believer and a nominal believer. I find such categories useful in some contexts. The issue in reading Hebrews is whether or not the author uses such a category to explain his audience.

Again, there are plenty of things to consider and I'll jot down what I taught my classes at Trinity, and (here again) let you know that I was surprised at how many students agreed with the conclusions.

First, the author often includes himself with the audience by using the term "we." 2:1-4; 3:14; 4:1, 11, 14-16; 6:1; 10:19; 12:1-3, 25-29.

Second, the author calls his audience "brothers." 3:1, 12; 10:19; 13:22. Perhaps 3:1 needs to be quoted: "holy brothers who share in the heavenly calling."

At 2:11-17 we have the following thread about what "brother" means: "For this reason Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers [and sisters], 12 saying, "I will proclaim your name to my brothers [and sisters], in the midst of the congregation I will praise you."... 17 Therefore he had to become like his brothers [and sisters] in every respect, so that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of the people.

Third, at 4:3 he calls his audience "believers." This text is not distinguishing genuine from false, but believers from non-believers. Believers, it says, enter into the rest. [Yes, it needs to be noted: a believer who enters the rest perseveres. But, this does not mean that those who do not persevere were not believers, but that those who do not persevere will not enter the rest.]

Fourth, sometimes the author sees his audience as "you." This suggests he thinks some of them will not make it. See 3:12; 5:11; 12:18-24.

Fifth, 10:29 needs to be read carefully: "How much worse punishment do you think will be deserved by those who have spurned the Son of God, profaned the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified, and outraged the Spirit of grace?" Here the "you" have spurned the Son of God, and profaned the blood, and were (already) sanctified by the blood, and are outraging the Spirit.

Sixth, at 2:3-4 the author recounts their conversion experience; at 6:10 they are those who have showed love in the name of Christ; at 10:22 they have had their hearts sprinkled and been cleansed of a guilty conscience; at 10:32-34 we see evidence of their enduring persecutions.

Put together, this all indicates a full Christian experience: conversion, gifts and manifestations of the Holy Spirit, the work of the death of Christ, and a Christian community commitment.

Seventh, now briefly on 6:4-6: the author claims that those who have reached a certain level and turn back cannot be restored unto repentance. (This is a singular comment; it is grave.)

Enlightened: see 10:32. An early Christian conversion term.

Tasted...: see 2:9; 6:4, 5. This does not mean “taste” as in dabble, but is a metaphor for “experience.” See at 2:9 — one does not merely “dabble” in death; it means to die.

Partaken in the Spirit: refers to early Christian experience of the Holy Spirit.

Tasted Word... again, experienced the powers of God’s Word.

Again, these verses put it all together: a full Christian experience.

Here’s my summary: indeed, the author sees his audience as mixed. Mixed, in the sense of those who will persevere and those who will not. Not mixed in the sense of frauds and genuine. There is no suggestion in the book of the latter category, but plenty of the former. There is all kinds of evidence that he thought some would persevere and some would not; he never suggests those who do not persevere are frauds. There is a big difference.

My conclusion is this: the author of Hebrews saw his audience as believers but knew that some would fall away, or had fallen away, or might fall away. For those who did, there would be no final rest. The implication is that a believer can fall away.

When I taught this I was surprised by the number of students who agreed. In fact, I told them that I was surprised. This view of Hebrews is not typical among the sorts of Evangelicals we had at Trinity, though it is common among Wesleyan Evangelicals and others like them. And, it was also clear to them that I did not give them better grades to agree with me: in fact, the best papers I read were by those of the Calvinist side because of the challenge these conclusions brought them. I can say that those classes at TEDS were some of the best classes I ever taught. Significance of a theological and pastoral and personal nature filled the air.

Tomorrow (or later today if I find time) I will answer this question: “So What?”

If you want a copy of my technical article on these passages from *Trinity Journal* 13 (1992) 21-59, please send me a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The envelope should be big enough to hold a small booklet 6” by 9”; I have about 25 copies and will send them to the first 25 who send me a stamped envelope.

**AUGUST 2, 2005**

[Post-Calvinism: So what?](#)

Filed under: [Post-Calvinism](#) — Scot McKnight @ 8:38 pm

What difference does it make, really, to be either Calvinist or Arminian in one's interpretation of the Warning Passages of Hebrews? There are lots of ways to talk about "difference," but at the level of concrete Christian living does it make all that much difference?

I begin with this observation. It makes a huge difference for the contemporary Evangelical who believes in eternal security, assurance of faith, and that anyone who has received Christ cannot genuinely fall away. The slogan "once saved, always saved" is put into deep threat by the view of Hebrews I have offered.

For the classical Calvinist and the Arminian — and I know this may sound like a bundle of hooy to many — there is precious little difference in this regard: *both believe that perseverance is necessary*. Which means that both believe that only those who do follow through in their relationship will find that eternal rest.

But, I have given you a bit of my own journey. Here's what I noticed.

First, I sensed a renewal of the sense of the *fear of God* that is so prominent in Hebrews. Once I came to the conviction that a person, yea that I, could believe *and* fall away, sin became more important and the prospect of falling away more realistic. Now don't get me wrong, I don't live in some morbid fear. Assurance accompanies faithfulness for both the Calvinist and the Arminian. Both, at least in my case, know that redemption is rooted in the saving powers of Christ and that faith — in the sense of faithfulness and trust — is required.

Second, it influenced how I presented *the gospel*. However one wants to present the gospel, through some tract or through personal story or through some piece of rational logic, the summons to believe for me is a summons to become a believer — not just to believe once and for all in a singular moment. The summons to perseverance is part and parcel of the summon to believe.

Third, I am persuaded that holding to this view does not mean that I (or anyone who shares it with me) believes that I contribute to my own salvation. Instead, what this doctrine encourages me to do is to believe, to watch, and to persevere. It makes me more conscious of the need of grace and the power of the Holy Spirit.

Fourth, and here I ask for your indulgence in a question I have asked for 20 years: is it possible that some biblical writers are more Arminian and some more Calvinist? If so, we'd have to ask in what the unity of Scripture consists. Does it consist in a systematic theology that somehow is behind everything said or does it consist in the essence of the gospel and the summons to live before God in the community of faith? That's for another time, but this is an area that deserves to be explored.

Before signing off for the evening, let me mention two pieces of reading that differ with me.

T. Schreiner, A. Caneday, [\*The Race Set before Us\*](#).

T. Schreiner, B. Ware, [\*The Grace of God and the Bondage of the Will\*](#).

I will be doing some blogs on Top Ten Books in various areas and on the Lord's Prayer as Love Prayer beginning tomorrow, and soon will do some blogs on "Generous (Evangelical) Orthodoxy."

I want to thank the many who have responded to this series. I sat on the idea awhile because I thought it could divide more than unite. What I do think is that an autobiographical approach is less divisive, though our differences do remain.

**AUGUST 29<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

[Why I Kissed Calvinism Good-bye](#)

Filed under: [Theology](#), [Post-Calvinism](#) — Scot McKnight @ 4:20 am

I've been asked by a handful of people to comment about the most recent article in *Christianity Today* called "Young, Restless, Reformed," the cover story for September's edition. Calvinism, the article records, is making a comeback among young evangelical (especially Baptist) Christians.

OK, I know, the title for today's post comes from Joshua Harris, who wrote that famous book about kissing dating good-bye, but he is featured in this article as a good example of these new, young Calvinists.

What do I think of the article? It's a good one, and I think everyone should read it. I have watched the rise of these young Calvinists and it is, as the editor says, a sizeable movement. What do I think of the trend? Long ago (in blog time) I posted a series called "[Post Calvinism](#)" and I'll give you the basics here.

I love the "architecture" of Calvinism — that is, the focus on God's glory and loving God, and I love the magnitude of grace in that theology, and I even love the radical transcendence that is often found in Calvinism. The *CT* piece frequently connects the attraction of young Christians to Calvinism because of its beauty.

When I was in college I sat for afternoons in our library and pored through Calvin's *Institutes*, leading my dear wife to comment that I'd be better off underlining what I didn't like because I had underlined most everything! Calvin's *Institutes* are doxological; I still dip into him and read him. And, at the same time, I was a huge, huge fan of Spurgeon and read his *Autobiography* twice while in college. And, of course, other Calvinists banged around my desk — like the ever-wordy John Owen and I read devotionally John Brown's commentary on Hebrews and Manton on James.

Then I went to seminary at Trinity, Grant Osborne asked me to be his TA, and one of his first assignments was to work through his extensive notes on the Calvinist-Arminian debate. Which I did. To be up to snuff on it, I read Howard Marshall's *Kept by the Power of God* — and my mind changed. Not all at once, but this is what I remember: the consistency of the OT warnings for the

covenant community formed a natural bridge for me to the NT warnings. And I couldn't contest his many, many passages that all added up to one thing: genuine believers can lose their faith by throwing it away consciously. (You can read my posts on that if you want to see how I spell it out.)

Then I began teaching at TEDS, then I was asked to teach Hebrews, and then I made a special study of the warning passages in Hebrews, and from that time on I was simply convinced that no matter how much I liked the architecture of Calvinism, I couldn't believe the system (TULIP, etc) because of the warning passages in Hebrews — and they then influenced how I read such things as Col 1:23 and the like. If the warning passages in Hebrews are what I think they are, then the systematics of Calvinism are unbiblical — lest, like one of my TEDS colleagues, you think both sorts are found in the Bible.

Now a few comments about the article:

First, one heart of this movement is the singular, clear, and heart-felt vision of John Piper.

Second, the other heart of this movement is Southern Seminary. The story of the changes at Southern is sketched in the article: the take-over led to a Calvinization of the seminary and the pastors coming out of there now are Calvinists. The article suggests that tensions are rising in the SBC about the place of Calvinism in the SBC.

Third, this movement isn't going away. It carries with it a robust theological vision that can be intoxicatingly doxological — and I have no quarrel with that — but I sure hope they spend more time in Hebrews and, if the book hasn't been hidden, I hope students are exposed to Howard Marshall's *Kept by the Power of God*.