

ST 515: Scripture, Theology Proper, Anthropology

Reformed Theological Seminary,
Washington, DC
January 29-February 2, 2018

Scott R. Swain
sswain@rts.edu

Course description

This course explores biblical doctrine from a systematic perspective. Topics include Scripture, theology proper, and anthropology (3 hours).

Textbooks

Michael Allen and Scott R. Swain, ed., *Christian Dogmatics: Reformed Theology for the Church Catholic* (Baker Academic, 2016). ISBN 13: 9780801048944

James Dolezal, *All That is in God: Evangelical Theology and the Challenge of Classical Theism*. (Reformed Heritage Books, 2017)

Gilles Emery, *The Trinity: An Introduction to Catholic Doctrine on the Triune God* (Catholic University of America Press, 2011). ISBN 13: 9780813218649

Hans Madueme, "The Most Vulnerable Part of the Whole Christian Account': Original Sin and Modern Science," chapter 11 in Hans Madueme and Michael Reeves, ed., *Adam, the Fall, and Original Sin: Theological, Biblical and Scientific Perspectives* (Baker Academic, 2014). (Available from professor)

Ian A. McFarland, *From Nothing: A Theology of Creation* (Westminster John Knox, 2014). ISBN 13: 9780664238193

John Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (P & R, 1977). ISBN 13: 9780875523415

Timothy Ward, *Words of Life: Scripture as the Living and Active Word of God* (IVP Academic, 2009). ISBN 13: 9780830827442

Assignments

1. Psalms report (5 % of final grade): Students are required to read Psalms 1, 8, 51, 104, 119, and 145 slowly and prayerfully at least four times over the course of the semester. Students will provide a reading report on the second exam indicating whether or not they have done so.

2. Reading report (20 % of final grade): Attached to the second exam, students will turn in a reading report stating the percentage of the assigned readings that they have read with reasonable care over the course of the semester.

3. Exam (50 % of final grade): Students will take one exam which will test their critical grasp of doctrinal topics covered in class lectures, readings, and the Reformed confessions as well as their ability to communicate doctrinal topics in a clear and cogent manner.

4. Research paper (25 % of final grade): Students will write 12-15 page research paper on one of the topics treated in the course. Papers will be evaluated based on their ability (1) to articulate a clear thesis that rests upon sound biblical and theological argumentation and that addresses the strongest counterarguments to the thesis; (2) to engage with appropriate scholarly resources (at least ten, with bibliography attached); (3) to follow the prescribed format (double spaced, Times New Roman font, Turabian format). For more details on the research paper, see below: "How to research and write a research paper."

Academic Policies

1. Late assignments: Apart from exceptional circumstances, I will not accept late assignments for credit.

2. Plagiarism: Plagiarism, whether intentional or unintentional, will result in a failing grade for the course.

Schedule of Assignments

Jan 29	Allen and Swain, chaps. 1-2; Ward, all
Jan 30	Allen and Swain, chaps. 3-5; Dolezal, all; Emery, all
Jan 31	Allen and Swain, chaps. 6-8
Feb 1	McFarland, all
Feb 2	Murray, all; Madueme
Feb 19	Research paper due (submitted online via Canvas)

Mar 5 Exam, Psalms report, and reading report due (submitted online via Canvas)

How to research and write a research paper¹

I. Elements of a sound theological argument

A. Introduction

1. The major elements of a sound theological argument include the following²

- a. Thesis/claim
- b. Grounds
- c. Warrants
- d. Backing
- e. Qualifier
- f. Rebuttal

* **Note:** These are *elements* of a sound theological argument, not *sections* of your research paper.

2. More briefly put, those elements include

- a. Thesis/claim
- b. Arguments and evidence that support your thesis
- c. Arguments and evidence that rebut objections to your thesis

B. Thesis/claim: A thesis statement is the *major claim or assertion* of your research paper. The entire research paper is devoted to *establishing* your thesis through sound biblical and theological argumentation and to *defending* your thesis against objections.

1. Diagnostic questions

- a. Is my thesis statement significant?
- b. Is my thesis statement specific?

2. Examples of good thesis statements

- a. "Although the Westminster Standards do not refer explicitly to the doctrine of the *pactum salutis*, the substance of the doctrine as taught by many 17th century Reformed divines is affirmed therein."

¹ For further guidance on this topic, see Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, *The Craft of Research*.

² Adapted from Stephen Toulmin, *The Uses of Argument*.

b. "In his controversial redefinition of the traditional Protestant doctrine of justification, N. T. Wright confuses the general issue of covenant membership with the particular issue of justification, which does not connote one's covenant membership but one's legal right to covenant blessings."

c. "Although Reformed systematic theology is sometimes accused of neglecting the person and work of the Holy Spirit, the triadic structure of the Reformed doctrine of salvation (i.e., *pactum salutis*, *historia salutis*, *ordo salutis*) provides a robust framework for appreciating the Holy Spirit's role in saving sinners."

d. "The grace of adoption is the temporal term (i.e., goal) of the Son's incarnate mission."

3. A good resource for developing a theological thesis: the "*quaestio*" (see, for example, Zacharias Ursinus' *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism* or Francis Turretin's *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*)

4. Distinguishing the "order of discovery" from the "order of composition": a good plan of research that leads to a good research paper

a. Usually, one develops a thesis very late in the process of researching a topic.

b. Thus, one's research strategy should not be first to devise a thesis and then to do one's research.

c. Rather, one should (i) find a topic that interests you, (ii) research it thoroughly, (iii) gather a broad understanding of the issues, questions, debates, and arguments related to your topic, and (iv) finally construct a thesis that one can argue on the basis of the research you have undertaken.

d. You can then structure a paper around proving and defending your thesis statement on the basis of your research.

C. Grounds: Grounds provide the reasons and evidences used to support the paper's thesis/major claim

1. Note: The *type* of theology paper that you are writing (see II. below) will determine the *type* of grounds to which you must appeal in establishing your thesis.

2. Potential sources for grounding a theological claim include:

a. Biblical exegesis

b. Ecclesiastical authority (creeds, confessions, trusted doctors of the church, ecclesiastical consensus); in classical dogmatic reasoning, these subordinate authorities provide "probable" arguments in doctrinal argumentation

c. Historical evidence

- d. Rational arguments³
- e. Reliable scholarship (primary and secondary sources)

D. Warrants: Warrants (which often remain implicit in your paper) connect your *grounds* to your *thesis/claim* by explaining the *logical relevance* of your grounds to your thesis. In other words, warrants answer the question: “Why do *these* arguments or *this* evidence ‘count as’ support for *this* thesis/claim.”

1. You do not always need to state your warrants explicitly. Sometimes warrants are shared by you and your reader or by the persons whose claims are being debated in your paper.

* **For example:** A paper criticizing N. T. Wright’s view of justification would not necessarily need to explain why biblical exegesis must be determinative for one’s view of justification. That is not a point of dispute between Wright and confessional Protestants.

2. You may need to spell out your warrants when they are not shared by all parties in a debate, or when the particular relevance of an argument or piece of evidence may not be self-evident to your reader.

* **For example:** A paper defending the practice of infant baptism might need to explain why it is that an OT passage would bear on the discussion of a NT sacrament.

3. In the process of your research, you should *always* ask yourself whether or not your arguments and evidence are warranted, i.e., *whether and how* they provide support to your thesis/claim.

E. Backing: Backing provides *further support for your warrants*, though it may not support your thesis directly.

* **For example:** In trying to explain the warrant for using OT texts in an argument for infant baptism, you might appeal to the sound hermeneutical practice of building *other* doctrines via redemptive-historical exegesis, i.e., by reading the Bible from beginning to end.

F. Qualifiers: Qualifiers put limitations on your thesis/claim and protect you from overstating your case.

1. Sample thesis: “Although Reformed systematic theology is sometimes accused of neglecting the person and work of the Holy Spirit, the triadic structure of the Reformed doctrine of salvation (i.e., *pactum salutis*, *historia salutis*, *ordo salutis*) provides a robust framework for appreciating the Holy Spirit’s role in saving sinners.”

³ Chapter eight of John Frame’s *DKG* provides a helpful introduction to the use of rational argumentation in theology.

2. Sample qualifier: “Although Reformed systematic theology is sometimes accused of neglecting the person and work of the Holy Spirit, the triadic structure of the Reformed doctrine of salvation (i.e., *pactum salutis, historia salutis, ordo salutis*) provides a robust framework for appreciating the Holy Spirit’s role in saving sinners. *To be sure, Reformed Christians have sometimes failed to appreciate the significance of the third person of the Trinity, but this occurs as a result of neglecting their system of theology and not as its natural consequence.*”

G. Rebuttal: In your rebuttal, you acknowledge, accurately summarize, and refute objections to your claim, as well as the grounds (and sometimes warrants) upon which those objections are based.

* **Note: Strong thesis statements** are built upon the acknowledgment, fair summarization, and cogent refutation of the **strongest possible objections** to the thesis.

II. Types of theology papers

A. All papers in this course must articulate and defend a thesis statement related to one of the doctrines discussed in this course.

B. Nevertheless, you may approach your topic from one of the following different perspectives:

1. The primarily *exegetical* theology paper: Focus on a particular biblical text or series of biblical texts which articulate the biblical “grammar” of your doctrine.

2. The primarily *historical* theology paper: Focus on a historical figure(s), text(s), or event(s) related to your chosen doctrinal topic.

3. The primarily *dogmatic* theology paper: Focus on expounding a particular doctrinal *locus*, providing a summary of the biblical and theological grounds upon which that *locus* rests, and refuting the major objections to it.

III. Research paper format

A. There is a difference between *constructing* a sound theological argument (= logic) and *presenting* a sound theological argument (= rhetoric). Through your research, you will construct a sound theological argument. In your paper, you will present that argument in rhetorically fitting, clear English prose.

B. Paper structure

1. Introduction: The first 2-3 paragraphs of your paper should:

a. Pique the reader’s interest in your topic →

b. Provide a brief introduction to the problem (*quaestio!*) which your paper seeks to address → [Note: your work in I.B.4.c.(iii) provides the basis for this.]

c. Clearly state your *thesis*—the specific, significant claim that your paper seeks to prove through sound argumentation and evidence and to defend against objections (note: your thesis is a *claim* that *addresses or answers* the problem/*quaestio* you raise in your introduction [see sample theses above]) →

d. Provide a brief overview of the structure of your paper.

2. Body:

a. In the body of your paper, you will elaborate upon your thesis, adequately furnish grounds that support your thesis, discuss and defend warrants as necessary, and deal with objections fairly and decisively.

b. The *structure* of the body of your paper will vary depending upon the type of paper that you are writing (e.g., exegetical, historical, dogmatic, etc.).

c. Nevertheless, the structure should be transparent to your reader and should be written in such a way that the reader can follow your argument as easily as possible.

3. Conclusion: In the last paragraph of your paper, you will restate/summarize your thesis and its supporting argumentation, and briefly point to the relevance of your thesis for the church's thought and/or life.

4. Sample structure for the body of a paper written to support the following thesis:
"Although the Westminster Standards do not refer explicitly to the doctrine of the *pactum salutis*, the substance of the doctrine as taught by many 17th century Reformed divines is affirmed therein."

a. Introduction

b. Body

i. Briefly trace the *historical development* of the doctrine of the *pactum salutis* and summarize the major *elements* of the doctrine as presented by 17th century Reformed divines.

ii. Demonstrate that the *term* "*pactum salutis*" (or its terminological equivalents) does not appear in the Westminster Standards.

iii. Demonstrate that the *elements* of the doctrine do appear in the Westminster Standards; discuss the *places* where those elements do appear; discuss any *terms* that appear in the Westminster Standards and that typically appear in discussions of the *pactum salutis* (e.g., "surety," etc.).

iv. Discuss reasons (found in your research and/or offered by other scholars) why the *pactum salutis* is not explicitly mentioned in the Westminster Standards, including suggestions that the Westminster divines either *objected* to this doctrine or found it otherwise *unworthy of inclusion* in the Confession and Catechisms.

v. Discuss corroborating evidence for believing that the Westminster Standards affirm the substance of the doctrine (e.g., explicit mention of the doctrine in “The Sum of Saving Knowledge”; explicit mention of the doctrine in The Savoy Declaration; explicit defense of the doctrine by Westminster divines in other publications; etc.).

c. Conclusion

IV. Other requirements

A. The paper should be 12-15 pages, double spaced, 12 pt Times New Roman font, Turabian format

B. The paper should be written in *clear, interesting, formal* English prose (use a proofreader!), without any grammatical or spelling mistakes.

C. The paper should interact intelligently and fairly with at least 10 scholarly (non-internet) resources.

V. A note on authorial point of view

A. In this research paper, you are not expected to make an original contribution to scholarship or to change the landscape of academic theology in the 21st century.

B. One of the main goals of this paper is to help you become a *thoughtful and articulate representative* of the church’s confession. In other words, this paper should help you become someone who speaks eloquently *for* the church on the basis of an *intelligent, well-instructed grasp* of the biblical and theological foundations of the church’s confession (cf. 2 Pet 3.16).

C. This goal is not a roadblock to true theological creativity but a means of empowering and enabling true theological creativity: One must *first* have a profound grasp of the “grammar” of theology before one can compose “creative” theological statements (in prayer, sermons, papers, etc.). Too often, we skip the foundational step of mastering our theological “grammar,” and that is why we often stutter.

Select bibliography

In addition to the standard systematic theological works of Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, Francis Turretin, Charles Hodge, Herman Bavinck, Karl Barth, etc., the following books will assist further study of the doctrinal topics discussed in this course.

Khaled Anatolios, *Retrieving Nicaea: The Development and Meaning of Trinitarian Doctrine* (Baker Academic, 2011)

Augustine, *Four Anti-Pelagian Writings* in *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 86 (Catholic University Press of America, 1992)

Augustine, *The Trinity* (New City Press, 1991)

Basil the Great, *Hexaemeron* NPNF, Second Series, Vol. 8 (Eerdmans, n.d.)

Stephen Holmes, *The Quest for the Trinity: The Doctrine of God in Scripture, History, and Modernity* (IVP Academic, 2012)

Michael Horton, *Covenant and Eschatology: The Divine Drama* (WJK, 2002)

Franciscus Junius, *A Treatise on True Theology* (Reformation Heritage Books, 2014)

Kelly Kapic and Bruce McCormack, ed., *Mapping Modern Theology: A Thematic and Historical Introduction* (Baker Academic, 2012)

Michael Kruger, *Canon Revisited: Establishing the Origins and Authority of the New Testament Books* (Crossway, 2012)

Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will* (Revell, 1957)

Richard Muller, *Divine Will and Human Choice: Freedom, Contingency, and Necessity in Early Modern Reformed Thought* (Baker Academic, 2017)

Richard Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 Vols. (Baker Academic, 2003)

Josef Pieper, *Happiness and Contemplation* (St. Augustine's Press, 1998)

Alvin Plantinga, *Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion, and Naturalism* (Oxford, 2011)

Christopher C. Roberts, *Creation and Covenant: The Significance of Sexual Difference in the Moral Theology of Marriage* (T & T Clark, 2007)

Fred Sanders, *The Triune God* (Zondervan Academic, 2016)

Roger Scruton, *On Human Nature* (Princeton University Press, 2017)

Mark Sheridan, *Language for God in Patristic Thought: Wrestling with Biblical Anthropomorphism* (IVP Academic, 2015)

Katherine Sonderegger, *Systematic Theology*, Volume 1: The Doctrine of God (Fortress, 2015)

Dolf te Velde, ed., *Synopsis of a Purer Theology* (Brill, 2015-)

Terrance Tiessen, *Providence and Prayer: How Does God Work in the World?* (IVP Academic 2000)

Willem van Asselt et al, *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology* (Baker Academic, 2010)

B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (P & R, 1980)

John Webster, *God Without Measure: Working Papers in Christian Theology*, 2 Vols. (Bloomsbury, 2015)

John Webster, *The Domain of the Word: Scripture and Theological Reason* (Bloomsbury, 2014)

Course Objectives Related to MDiv* Student Learning Outcomes

Course: ST 515
 Professor: Swain
 Campus: DC
 Date: Winter 2018

<u>MDiv* Student Learning Outcomes</u>		<u>Rubric</u>	<u>Mini-Justification</u>
<p><i>In order to measure the success of the MDiv curriculum, RTS has defined the following as the intended outcomes of the student learning process. Each course contributes to these overall outcomes. This rubric shows the contribution of this course to the MDiv outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>*As the MDiv is the core degree at RTS, the MDiv rubric will be used in this syllabus.</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Strong ➤ Moderate ➤ Minimal ➤ None 	
Articulation (oral & written)	Broadly understands and articulates knowledge, both oral and written, of essential biblical, theological, historical, and cultural/global information, including details, concepts, and frameworks.	Strong	Exam, paper
Scripture	Significant knowledge of the original meaning of Scripture. Also, the concepts for and skill to research further into the original meaning of Scripture and to apply Scripture to a variety of modern circumstances. (Includes appropriate use of original languages and hermeneutics; and integrates theological, historical, and cultural/global perspectives.)	Strong	Focus of all ST courses
Reformed Theology	Significant knowledge of Reformed theology and practice, with emphasis on the Westminster Standards.	Strong	Focus of all ST courses
Sanctification	Demonstrates a love for the Triune God that aids the student's sanctification.	Moderate	Emphasized in lectures
Desire for Worldview	Burning desire to conform all of life to the Word of God.	Strong	Focus of all ST courses
Winsomely Reformed	Embraces a winsomely Reformed ethos. (Includes an appropriate ecumenical spirit with other Christians, especially Evangelicals; a concern to present the Gospel in a God-honoring manner to non-Christians; and a truth-in-love attitude in disagreements.)	Moderate	
Preach	Ability to preach and teach the meaning of Scripture to both heart and mind with clarity and enthusiasm.	Minimal	ST provides deeper understanding of Scripture
Worship	Knowledgeable of historic and modern Christian-worship forms; and ability to construct and skill to lead a worship service.	Minimal	Focus on doctrine of God and providence assists in practice of prayer

Shepherd	Ability to shepherd the local congregation: aiding in spiritual maturity; promoting use of gifts and callings; and encouraging a concern for non-Christians, both in America and worldwide.	None	
Church/World	Ability to interact within a denominational context, within the broader worldwide church, and with significant public issues.	Moderate	