Jeremy R. Treat. *The Crucified King: Atonement and Kingdom in Biblical and Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014.

In this published version of his Wheaton College doctoral dissertation, Jeremy Treat aims to interweave two major biblical themes—atonement and kingdom—often held apart or even put at odds in biblical scholarship and theological literature. Treat writes from within the Reformed evangelical tradition, exhibiting fondness for Luther and (especially) Calvin, and primarily for an audience comprising readers from the Reformed tradition. His book challenges that tradition to develop a theological perspective that better integrates not only atonement and kingdom themes but also biblical and systematic theology.

The book is structured in two major sections—biblical theology and systematic theology. In the biblical section, Treat seeks to demonstrate how an interconnection of kingdom and atonement emerges from the Genesis narrative of creation and covenant, crescendos in the prophecies of salvation and suffering (especially Second Isaiah), shapes the overall trajectory of the gospel narrative (especially Mark), and concludes the biblical canon (Colossians and Revelation). In the systematic section, he strives to formulate a doctrinal framework integrating penal substitution with *Christus Victor* and cross with kingdom.

Treat states his major thesis throughout the book: "*Christus Victor* through penal substitution" (39); "royal victory *through* atoning suffering" (58) "The great exchange on the cross of Christ effects the great transition to the kingdom of God" (139); "The kingdom is the ultimate goal of the cross, and the cross is the means by with the kingdom comes" (247).

Although the author wants to correct the penal-substitution-only/mainly mindset of much evangelical thinking about atonement theology, he does not develop a biblical case for penal substitution but presumes it from the beginning. Nor does he directly engage with substantive criticism of penal substitution, confining critics and apologists to consecutive footnotes (175). While many places he simply glosses penal substitution onto textual exposition not warranting it, he acknowledges that penal substitution is not really there in some key texts cited for his thesis (cf. 58-59, 204-207). Of course, Treat does not set out to persuade on penal substitution—his

intended audience agrees entirely with him on that. Still, he may fail to carry along readers not already convinced.

Even taken on its own aims and terms, this volume has two significant shortcomings. First, while the biblical endeavor to coordinate kingdom and atonement is praiseworthy, the argument stumbles from the start. Treat subtly slides Abraham's substitutionary sacrifice into an atoning sacrifice (61-62), when the text names it a "burnt offering" (Gen. 22:2). He asserts, without citing textual support, that the Passover lamb served to propitiate God's wrath (63). He bypasses Leviticus, offering no exegetical interpretation of the sacrificial cult to corroborate his thesis. He ignores or downplays evidence contrary to his key claim that the Isaianic servant is to be identified with the messianic king. That the Hebrew and Greek texts both explicitly identify the servant as "Jacob/Israel" (Isaiah 42:1 LXX; 49:3 MT) gets no mention, and that none of the four servant songs in Hebrew or Greek identifies the servant as "king" or "anointed" is declared "of little significance" (70-71). And then, declining to exegete Isaiah 53, he opts to "cut to the heart of the matter: the suffering of the servant is depicted in terms of substitutionary atonement" (81).

Second, while Treat's systematic attempt to integrate cross and kingdom is also appreciated, his "kingdom-cross interplay" is mostly a one-way exercise. Penal substitution and *Christus Victor* do not forge an equal partnership—penal substitution does all the heavy lifting. Because the theological relationship between victory and sacrifice is hermeneutically predetermined by "the major biblical theme of the wrath of God" (182), penal substitution holds all the "explanatory power" in atonement theology (223), such that "the victory of the cross is dependent on the vicarious suffering of the Christ" (224). Likewise, kingdom and cross are said to be "mutually interpretive" (141) and "mutually enriching" (247), but the cross holds all the interpretive keys. Treat does elaborate "the cruciform nature of the kingdom" (229), but not the actual content of Jesus' ministry of teaching and healing (cf. 92-94). In effect, he does not consider how the kingdom might reorient our view of the cross because, I think, he does not expect Jesus' enactment of the kingdom to reveal anything about how God achieves victory (cf. 42-43).

Darrin W. Snyder Belousek, Lecturer in Philosophy and Religion, Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio and Bluffton University, Bluffton, Ohio