
Pro Rege

Volume 52 | Number 1

Article 2

September 2023

Clarifying the Application of the Temple Metaphor in Christian Education

Donald Roth

Dordt University, donald.roth@dordt.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Roth, Donald (2023) "Clarifying the Application of the Temple Metaphor in Christian Education," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 52: No. 1, 5 - 13.

Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol52/iss1/2

This Feature Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Dordt Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Dordt Digital Collections. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.

Clarifying the Application of the Temple Metaphor in Christian Education



by Donald Roth

Too often in academia, we feel as if we're speaking into the void. The peer-reviewed writing of academics is lucky to find an audience of hundreds; and even where more popular writing might find its way to thousands, it's rare that our thoughts provoke more than passing engagement. In this way, criticism is one of the sincerest forms of encouragement I get in my writing. It signals two things that were deeply important to me when I wrote "Building the Temple"¹: first, it means my thesis

Donald Roth, with a J.D. from Georgetown University and LL.M in Taxation from Georgetown University, is Professor of Criminal Justice and Business Administration, as well as Co-Director of the Kuyper Honors Program at Dordt University. He wrote this article in response to a critique of his earlier article.

wasn't so milquetoast or derivative as to be benignly passed over, and second, it means that at least one person cared enough about what I said to engage with it, even if in counterpoint.

Although I object to many of the criticisms that Dr. Chris Gousmett has levelled at my earlier article,² I consider it essential to begin my response by deeply thanking him for taking the time to engage so extensively with what I've written. I won't pretend to have said everything as clearly as I could the first time around, so I value this opportunity to clarify my thesis and refine points of agreement and disagreement. That said, a point-by-point response would lead us down a road of ever-lengthening discourse that would eventually alienate even the most dedicated reader. For that reason, I will limit the scope of my response to what I see as key points of misunderstanding, disagreement, and agreement. Ultimately, I hope to clarify and reemphasize my conviction that the "temple" metaphor deserves a key place in the way that we conceive of our Christian calling and the way that we train students for that calling in Christian education.

Clarifying My Thesis

To begin, I worry that the stain of guilt by association has clouded Gousmett's capacity to read what I was and was not asserting in "Building the Temple." While his review essay does take issue with the work of G.K. Beale, it's clear that Gousmett's sharpest bone to pick is with the work of David VanDrunen. However, in picking that

bone, Gousmett makes the assumption that my argument draws on VanDrunen as a “principal source,” and he goes further, engaging principally with VanDrunen at points and then asserting that VanDrunen and I are in agreement.³ This fundamentally misunderstands my article.

While I have had beneficial dialog with David VanDrunen and believe that his ideas are worth considering, I don’t subscribe to the Two Kingdoms approach. One of the first pieces I wrote for *Pro Rege* was centered on wrapping my head around the debate over the Two Kingdoms, specifically because I didn’t find myself in total agreement with either camp.⁴ I have also engaged critically with VanDrunen’s thought in other venues.⁵ In “Building the Temple,” my purpose in citing VanDrunen at all was based on his framing of the “Christian plumber problem” in *Living in God’s Two Kingdoms*, and I did so because I’ve heard almost the exact same question from the lips of my students wrestling with the significance of a Christian perspective for their education.⁶ I recognize that my first citation of VanDrunen’s work drew on his criticism of reformational views that I also criticize, but while I agree with parts of his critique of the more transformationalist approach, I also largely reject the redemptive/common distinction that VanDrunen makes.

Ultimately, if we can disentangle my article from guilt by association, it’s possible to see more clearly what I’m actually arguing. First, my argument is born from my interaction with faculty and students who are wrestling with the implications of their faith for their vocation. In my context, that significance is typically taken for granted yet rarely articulated clearly. At Dordt, students make sense of their calling more in terms of being “kingdom builders” than in any other of what I’ve called *narrative metaphors*.⁷ However, students still routinely ask what it is about the Christian perspective that makes their work in their discipline “uniquely Christian.” Typically, this means, “how does believing in Jesus affect the outcome of 2+2?” Further, speaking with my theology colleagues, I agree that our students’ shortfall in biblical literacy is troubling, and there’s reason to think that Dordt students exceed the average level of biblical engagement suggested by Barna. As a Christian who

thinks that the Bible should “shape our choices” (putting me in a hyper-minority of only five percent of American Christians surveyed by Barna), this question is unavoidable: what is it about the frame that we use, even at an institution in the Reformed tradition, that still struggles so mightily to overcome the modernist dichotomy of faith and life?⁸

I agree with Gousmett that “[f]aith does not stand over against learning; instead, faith underlies learning as the root from which it emerges.”⁹ At Dordt, our curriculum is rooted in four coordinates, one of which is the conviction that we have a fundamentally religious orientation.¹⁰ In fact, all humans do, but Christians seek to be oriented by true religion, rather than the idolatry that otherwise rules human hearts. At Dordt, that means we say our students should “be able to discern, evaluate, and challenge the prevailing spirits and world-views of our age in the light of God’s Word and our reformational perspective.”¹¹

I am convinced by Craig Gay’s assertion that one of the dominant spirits of our day is “practical atheism.” As he puts it in *The Way of the (Modern) World*, “the crucial threat that the modern world poses to faith does not actually lie in the denial of God’s existence as much as it lies in the tacit repudiation of divine *authority*. The question modernity raises—even for Christians—is whether or not God possesses any real authority to define our everyday existence.”¹² Barna’s findings suggest that Craig Gay is right, and I’ve heard the same struggle from students who often fail to see any practical connection between their faith and their daily lives beyond devotional endeavors. *This* is the challenge that led me to ask whether framing our task in terms of “Kingdom” might be failing us in some ways, and this is why I propose that we add a serious consideration of “Temple” to the way we frame the Christian task.

“Temple” Must be Fundamentally Compatible with “Kingdom”

Gousmett apparently rejects the notion that “Temple” is a meaningful way to frame the Christian task, and he argues that the biblical theme itself is “a post-fall concession to human sinfulness,” which he perceives as a trace of “Hebrew-centered religion,” which will be eradicated fully

in the last day.¹³ In this assessment, I disagree with Gousmett in the most strenuous of terms. In fact, if my proposal of the temple metaphor (when that proposal is properly understood) is truly “a fundamental challenge to the foundations of the reformational project,” then it can only be because of what is biblically wanting in those foundations. Of course, I don’t think Gousmett is properly construing my proposal, and, if anything, I believe that ac-

The Bible presents us with a story that captures our identity not only as subjects of the true king but also as messengers of his gospel, and it expresses this identity in the most intimate terms as dwelling-places of the Holy Spirit. Yes, the exact content of each of these points of emphasis will be different, and in this way, “Temple” is different from “Kingdom,” but these are perspectival emphases of a common narrative, and it is entirely legitimate to

Why is it fitting to think that concepts rooted in the temple metaphor might be appropriate for framing our Christian vocation?

cepting it will strengthen, not erode, the project of fully orb-ed Reformed education.¹⁴ Since Gousmett challenges Beale’s interpretation of the temple motif, I will make my case again without recourse to scholarship that might distract from my central contention.

Why is it fitting to think that concepts rooted in the temple metaphor might be appropriate for framing our Christian vocation? Because Reformed Christians have long asserted that Christ brings together the offices of Prophet, Priest, and King.¹⁵ The priest serves as a mediator in the place where the divine dwells in a special way. While Gousmett rightly points out that God does not live in temples made by humans (Acts 17:24),¹⁶ he is under-appreciating that the “fullness of deity dwells bodily” in Christ (Col. 2:9). Further, not only is Christ’s body a temple (John 2:21), but our bodies are as well (1 Cor. 6:19). In short, while the Hebrew temple is a type and shadow of a heavenly reality (Heb. 8:5), it is woven into a broader biblical theme. That theme starts with “[b]e fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion...”—that is, the cultural mandate, and it finds its fulfillment in a New Jerusalem filled with temples (human bodies) from every tribe and tongue mystically unified in the body of Christ. This Christ is that same Immanuel who in the eschaton comes to dwell with us in an intensification of the presence of the God who walked with Adam in the cool of the day (Gen. 3:8).

assert that we benefit from taking account of what the “Temple” frame might do in helping us account for our calling before God.

Continuity and the Eschaton

If the temple metaphor is therefore a legitimate perspective through which to understand the human purpose, my proposal proceeds on a more modest track than Gousmett accounts for. Indeed, in his positive statements about the eschaton, Gousmett signals that we are in several points of substantive agreement that I think recommend my proposal. To get to why that is so, however, I should first explain why the discussion of the eschaton is relevant here at all.

Why does the eschaton matter? When students are asking what difference the Christian perspective makes, they are often implicitly merging this question with another fundamental human question around significance. In the words of Psalm 8:4, “what is man that you are mindful of him, and the son of man that you care for him?” We have a natural human intuition to find meaning and significance in things that have eternal consequences. This intuition often finds comfort in the words of stoic philosophy famously captured by *Gladiator*’s Maximus Decimus Meridius: “What we do in life echoes in eternity.”¹⁷ Buried in the question of what difference a Christian perspective makes is a more personal question about what difference *we* make.

This merging of questions is one of the key

reasons I think the emphasis on the endurance of human cultural works ultimately leads us down an unhelpful path. Gousmett celebrates the reformational emphasis on the goodness of our common, everyday work. This is an emphasis that commends the work of Kuyper and continues down through the more narrow reformational strand of his legacy; however, as I mentioned, it does shift the spotlight of significance onto what we do in life, when we can't even be sure which of those works, if any, will survive into eternity.

What can we be more certain will survive? We will. A key part of my proposal regarding the temple metaphor is that it shifts our attention from debates over whether there will be iPhones in heaven to something with better biblical warrant for significance. Whether he would state it this way or not, Gousmett agrees with me. He states this most clearly when he says, "I suggest that it is not the cultural works themselves that are carried into the eschaton, but our training, our discipling, our faithfulness in what we do here, which shapes who we are and which will receive its proper reward in the age to come."¹⁸ Well said.

This excellent statement also serves as a good way for me to clarify my thesis. While I do hope for a reward in the age to come, I don't consider it to be a particularly compelling point of focus for this question. Given Scripture's account of the dubious inherent value of the works of our hands, I think our emphasis should be on how they make us who we are, not what reward they might bring. In this, I'm making a point similar to what James K.A. Smith does in his emphasis on the formative power of habituation, perhaps filtered through insights from Paul Ricoeur and other philosophers of identity. That point is this: whatever the status of the works of our hands, our understanding of our Christian vocation should recognize that the work we do shapes who we are, which has important connections to who we are as the body of Christ.

The point can be taken further into the eschaton, though, and this is something toward which I only gestured in "Building the Temple." In working out the implications of the temple frame, a key aspect is a recovery of the central place that our existence as "the image of God" should play in our thinking in this arena. Unfortunately, Christian

dialog about "image bearer" is often reduced to the semantic equivalent of saying "people matter" while losing the sense of *why* that might be so. If it's significant that we bear the image of God, it's important that we ask *to whom* we bear the image of God. The biblical witness strongly suggests that we bear God's image back to God Himself, to one another, and to all of Creation.

The important preposition "to" adds an ethical cast to the matter that grounds my entire thesis. In terms of Christian education, this "to whom we bear God's image" demands that educators help students learn to articulate the ways that they might reflect God's image in their lives and how they might do so better. Further, the temple frame reminds us that human beings have a special role as the merging point of spiritual and physical reality, which Bavinck considers crucial to our sense of what Christians do in the world.¹⁹ God has called His people in both a general and a specific sense, and while the content of His general call is the same for all Christians, our specific calling embraces *all* of the particularities of our day-to-day lives. We need to learn to respond to this calling in ways that foster ever closer connections between God and all of His creation (ourselves included). In line with what I argued in "Building the Temple," I believe that the temple metaphor aligns our attention with facets of our experience as God's children, facets that offer more satisfying answers to persistent questions like the Christian plumber problem. Further, I think it offers counterbalance to distorting features of our contemporary age that "Kingdom" fails to account for as easily.

What of Christian Plumbers?

Let's start with Christian plumbers then. While I agree with Gousmett that this is in many ways the wrong sort of question, it is nonetheless a question I hear my students and colleagues regularly wrestling with.²⁰ Just a couple of days ago, I heard a colleague ask a potential faculty candidate whether there will be government in heaven. It is a simple reality that the dominant frame offered at institutions like Dordt provokes questions about the uniqueness of Christian work and what of it might last into the age to come.

My intention is not to wade into the theologi-

cal debates over eschatology, common grace, or redemptive versus common kingdoms. Instead, I want to reason from something over which we have consensus. We might not agree on whether there will be plumbing in heaven, but we're more confident there will be plumbers (even if we're less sure about lawyers), so why might that matter? Put differently, why does God care that plumbers make up part of the more perfect image of God we find in the coming age?

Given Scripture's account of the dubious inherent value of the works of our hands, I think our emphasis should be on how they make us who we are, not what reward they might bring.

This is where my thesis presses back on Goussmett and VanDrunen both. VanDrunen sees common callings for Christians and plumbers and wonders why we care that they overlap.²¹ Goussmett argues that "A Christian plumber, on his or her own, cannot find a meaningful way of speaking about 'Christian plumbing'..."²² Both of these perspectives dilute or ignore the value of the particular in favor of a broader common/collective context. Ultimately, both of these perspectives fall short of accounting for the meticulous formative intent of a God who numbers even the hairs on our heads (Matthew 10:30).

If my conviction is right, then we still need to account for what difference it makes that there might be plumbers in heaven. I propose that this difference becomes clearer when we shift frames from "Kingdom" to "Temple." Rather than asking what a plumber does differently, we ask how a plumber is shaped and habituated by his/her vocation so as to reflect the image of God along the three relational lines mentioned above. VanDrunen rightly notes that this point entails a degree of subjectivity, and his concern for not limiting Christian liberty and discernment is laudable; however, especially where we are talking about education, we should not let the subjective aspects of an ethical task dissuade us from the task altogether. As Rosaria Butterfield has frequently maintained, "The job of the adjective is to change the noun."²³ The adjective Christian

should affect the plumber as plumber, not just as person, and it's part of the job of a fully orbed Reformed education to help cultivate the vocabulary that a particular plumber can use to describe that impact.

More than just suggesting different questions, the frame suggested by a metaphor tends to center different actions or contextualizations. While I argued before that "Kingdom" centers the political, I will emphasize here that "Temple" places a point

of emphasis on presence and the ways that our actions connect to and reflect the God that we serve and represent. While "Kingdom" invites us to consider how to support Christ's claim to "every square inch" of creation, "Temple" invites us to consider what it means to be "the aroma of Christ to God" (II Corinthians 2:15) throughout creation. I contend that both frames make an extensive claim on every aspect of our lives, including our vocations, but the sort of answer we might give in each context is different. Importantly, where one frame falls short of providing satisfying answers, it may benefit us to shift frames to another.

I recognize that I have not offered a comprehensive answer to how a plumber reflects the image of God or how plumbing prepares us for whatever new vocation we take on in the age to come. As I suggested in my last article, I lack some of the subjective experience needed to articulate that with authenticity. At a future point, I do intend to more fully articulate vocations closer to my experience, but when I say that "Temple" may offer more satisfying answers, I am asserting that an articulation that ties a plumber's daily life into the central calling of imaging God will have some of the personal, concrete dimensions that will be more compelling in today's context.

Recognizing our Context

Articulating vocation (and the education for

it) in terms of the temple metaphor will be more compelling in today's context because it more directly addresses key challenges of that context. Principally, I see this directness in the temple frame's answer to Gay's "practical atheism" and in the potential to satisfy our common preference for concreteness over abstraction.

The challenge of "practical atheism" stems from a deep-rooted materialism, which has animated society since at least the birth of modernity. This materialism has been described in various ways, but I think that Max Weber's notion of "disenchantment," particularly as developed by Charles Taylor, captures it particularly well. The essential notion is that we tend not to imagine the world as something suffused with a spiritual reality anymore. Instead of demon possession, we speak of brain dysfunction. Instead of woodland spirits, we speak of dark forests. Instead of a cosmos full of life, we speak of a universe that contains precious little of it. As is evident from my examples, this is a mixed bag. On the one hand, we may benefit from some disenchantment if we follow the pattern excoriated in Isaiah 44, where a woodcutter cuts down a tree and uses it both to build a fire and to fashion an idol. To this, we can beneficially ask with the prophet, "Shall I fall down before a block of wood?"²⁴

At the same time, disenchantment can also deny life and spirit where it does exist. A common theme of the first generation of neo-Calvinists highlights this point, criticizing a "mechanical" view of the universe in contrast with a more "organic" concept. When the universe boils down to cause and effect (here meaning just Aristotle's "efficient cause"), it becomes stripped of greater meaning. Bavinck anticipates something close to Gay's thesis when he writes, "Such a mechanical explanation of the world, I am convinced, constitutes a danger not only for Christianity and religion in general, but also for our entire culture and for all our ideals."²⁵

A key aspect of Reformed theology is its assertion of the absolute personal nature of reality. Watkin both summarizes and unpacks the implications of this assertion, but the essence is that the universe is grounded in an absolute, transcendent God, who is intimately, immanently invested in His Creation.²⁶ We see this investment

in the theme of God's presence in Scripture. It is simultaneously a brute fact and a calling. On the one hand, God is omnipresent, hovering over the waters, numbering the hairs on our heads, and granting breath to all that lives.²⁷ At the same time, God's call to fill the earth and subdue it is part of filling the earth with "the fragrance of the knowledge of him everywhere."²⁸

The temple metaphor is responsive to this threat of disenchantment by grounding itself in the given reality that God is present throughout Creation. At the same time, it gives shape to the calling of the cultural mandate, not so much in terms of cultural works as in the relational connection of our work to the God we serve. Further, it is the function of metaphors to suggest strategies of action, and I think exploring and developing the temple metaphor in this way has the possibility of also speaking to our preference for concrete over abstract connections.

It is a feature of at least the American context to constantly ask "so what?" Pragmatism marks the unique American contribution to philosophy through thinkers like John Dewey, and it's a key feature of the general ethos of American culture. In a world marked by post-modern relativism, it even makes sense: we can cut the Gordian Knot of competing "whys" by jumping straight to "how." Further, students tend to have a fair expectation that the things they learn will make a difference, so they often move from appreciating the fact that they've learned a new thing to asking what difference it should make in their daily life.

At the same time, as I've suggested in both this and my previous article, the persistence of the question (*how*) can point to a tacit embrace of a cultural frame that sharply distinguishes fact and value. In a cultural context that has warped earlier notions of sacred/secular divisions so that religion has little place outside of religious exercise, students need a way to articulate *how* all of life can be lived before the face of God. Further, in a context where the political is absolutized into partisan frameworks, we benefit from a frame where Christ declaring "mine" over every square inch of Creation is imagined in personal (but not private!) terms that go beyond party politics.

In this way, the temple metaphor offers a different path toward expressing the Christian calling in concrete terms. Specifically, it calls our attention to how we are formed and developed into the image of God in relation (back) to God, to others, and toward all Creation. This connection is what I believe can be fruitfully explored more by attending to the temple metaphor.

Since I may have caused confusion by discussing the formation of a plumber, let me close this

late to God as father will be directly and concretely shaped by how I serve as their father. I know many people who struggle with relating to God in this way because of their broken relationships with their fathers. This relationship testifies to a concrete ethical application in recognizing that not only is my body a temple of the Holy Spirit, but my bodily temple is also a vehicle by which God makes Himself known among His people. Put differently, I should live as a Father

The temple metaphor is responsive to this threat of disenchantment by grounding itself in the given reality that God is present throughout Creation.

section with an example that is both close to my experience and clearly warranted by Scripture. By God's grace, I am the father of three children. At the same time, God specifically tells us that we should consider Him our father.²⁹ A commitment to Christian doctrine tells us that God did not choose the image of father by accident. Instead, God ordained that we would reproduce sexually so that we would have fathers, and, in having fathers, have a tangible image to connect us to Him. How does this father image relate to a "temple" perspective? I see this in the three principal connections I mentioned before.

First, the temple perspective sees our earthly roles as something that relates us to God. Our fatherhood is a type of God's more comprehensive generation of us: children have the opportunity to build an intuitive sense of God's relation by their relation to their earthly father. Even more strongly, by ordaining this role as one that I can fulfill, I can come to understand a picture of God's love for me through the actual experience of fatherly love. Being a father gives me a particular perspective on who God is that draws me closer to Him by my experiencing something analogous to His loving relation to me.

This relationship flows naturally into our relation to others. As a Father, I image God to my children. I don't mean this in a generic sense. Instead, I mean that my children's ability to re-

late to God as father will be directly and concretely shaped by how I serve as their father. I know many people who struggle with relating to God in this way because of their broken relationships with their fathers. This relationship testifies to a concrete ethical application in recognizing that not only is my body a temple of the Holy Spirit, but my bodily temple is also a vehicle by which God makes Himself known among His people. Put differently, I should live as a Father

so that I illuminate, rather than obscure, people's ability to see God in me. Finally, by getting the chance to live this metaphor from both sides, being both child and father, I gain a concrete, experienced grounding from which to generalize to all of Creation. For one, God did not generate only humanity, and fatherhood is not the sole custodial role that we are invited to fulfill. While I should respect the limitations and differentiations among these different roles, something about being a father should shape me deeply so that the intuitions that I bring to other caretaking roles bear an inflection shaped by this experience. At the same time, my caretaking experience in other roles can beneficially inform and shape how I continue to approach parenting.

Living with a temple perspective on fatherhood means that I unpack the ways that this calling draws me closer to God. From that, I can explore how I am drawn closer to others and can indeed help connect them to God. Finally, I can explore how I can apply this concept to all aspects of creation. Broadening out from this, I can explore the facets of my many different callings in similar ways, allowing the insights gained there to freely intermingle. The temple perspective calls us to richly and intentionally cultivate the depths of what it means that we are God's image.

Where does this leave us?

I hope that this response has helped to clarify what I mean in arguing for an increased emphasis on “temple” as a way to frame our mission both as Christians and as institutions committed to intentionally forming Christians. I again thank Dr. Gousmett for helping to occasion this clarification, and I hope that my reply shows that we are perhaps not as far apart as it might have seemed at first.

Regardless, my hope is that this article further strengthens my case for why this sensibility might be generative in framing the task of Christian education. It could certainly use more exacting development, and I acknowledge that some of the implications here remain more suggestive than concrete. I also recognize that navigating a concept that has strong subjective components must be done carefully. Two fathers will be shaped differently by their experience, even though both image God. Further, when we move into more speculative areas like being a Christian police officer or pursuing innovation as a Christian businessperson, the task of education will be to provide tools more than prescriptions. At this point, some of these tools may be underexplored. That is the task that I hope to tackle more in the future, and I heartily invite colleagues and fellow travelers to pursue that development in further dialog with me.

Endnotes

1. Donald Roth, “‘Building the Temple’: An Alternative Metaphor to the Use of ‘Kingdom’ in the Christian University Context,” *Pro Rege*: Vol. 49: No. 4 (June 2021), 10-23.
Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol49/iss4/2
2. Chris Gousmett, “Is the Kingdom Metaphor Broken? Is the Reformational Vision Quixotic?: A Review Essay,” *Pro Rege*: Vol. 50: No. 4 (June 2022), 13-35.
Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol50/iss4/2
3. Gousmett, 14 and 19-20.
4. Donald Roth, “Operative Metaphor and Antimony: A Framework for Understanding the Two-Kingdoms/Neo-Kuyperian Debate,” *Pro Rege*: Vol. 44: No. 1 (Sep. 2015), 29-38.

Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol44/iss1/5

5. Donald Roth, “Toward a Covenantal Christian Political Theology: A Review of *Politics After Christendom*,” *In All Things* Jan. 10, 2023.
Available at: <https://inallthings.org/toward-a-covenantal-christian-political-theology-a-review-of-politics-after-christendom/>
6. Roth, “Building the Temple,” 17-18.
7. Donald Roth, “Narrative metaphor as a tool for exploring character formation,” *International Journal of Christianity & Education*, 25.1 (2021), 96-111.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2056997120972430>
8. See framing of this question in Roth, “Building the Temple,” 14.
9. Gousmett, 25.
10. Dordt University, *The Educational Framework of Dordt University* (Sioux Center: Dordt University, 2020), 8.
11. *Framework*, 8.
12. Craig Gay, *The Way of the (Modern) World Or, Why It’s Tempting to Live as if God Doesn’t Exist* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 238.
13. Gousmett, 22.
14. I do intentionally switch my language here. For better or worse, the “reformational” adjective has become associated with a particular strain of neo-Calvinist thought that I critique at several points in “Building the Temple.” To a degree, I believe this view reflects some of the abandonment of Kuyper and Bavinck’s thought that Gousmett applauds. While I would confidently identify as neo-Calvinist, I don’t claim to be reformational, and, as Gousmett’s reply suggests, reformational folks don’t claim me either.
15. This theme is evident in earlier Christian thought, but it’s explicit and formative for Reformed thought from Calvin on. See John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Trans. Lewis Battles. Ed. John Neill (Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960), 494.
16. Gousmett, 22.
17. Ridley Scott, *Gladiator* (Dreamworks, 2020).
18. Gousmett, 24. He goes even further than I am confident in asserting by saying, “I doubt that any of our current tasks and callings will be evident in the new earth....” (29).

19. Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Ethics: Created, Fallen, and Converted Humanity*. Ed. John Bolt (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2019), 33-34.
20. Gousmett, 27.
21. David VanDrunen, *Living in God's Two Kingdoms: A Biblical Vision for Christianity and Culture* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010), 192-93.
22. Gousmett, 28.
23. Cited by Sarah Bailey, "They're Gay, They're Christian And They're Celibate!" *Huffington Post*, Aug. 4, 2014.
24. Isaiah 44:19 (ESV).
25. Herman Bavinck, *Essays on Religion, Science, and Society*. Ed. John Bolt. Trans. Harry Boonstra and Harry and Gerrit Sheeres (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2008), 102.
26. See, e.g., Christopher Watkin, *Biblical Critical Theory* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Academic, 2022) 35-39.
27. Genesis 1:1, Matthew 10:30, and Psalm 104, respectively.
28. II Corinthians 14 (ESV).
29. E.g. Matthew 6:9 (ESV).