

Dissertation Defenses at Baptist Bible Seminary

— *Old Testament* —

Milton Morocho — *David, A Moabite? An Analysis of Deuteronomy 23:3-6 and the Book of Ruth, and the Theological Implications of David's Lineage*

Abstract: The Bible holds two truths that appear to contradict each other. Ruth 4:17 states that David is the third generation of Moabite descent. However, the law of Deuteronomy 23:3 prohibits the entry to the assembly of the Lord until the tenth generation of a descendant of a mixed marriage with a Moabite. These two biblical statements lead to the conclusion that David legally could not have entered the assembly of the Lord. The aim of this study is to harmonize these two realities. This study demonstrates that King David's heritage was not invalidated by his ancestral connection to Ruth, but not because God contravened the law. Rather, because he is sovereign over human affairs as well as the law, God allowed/permitted/ directed Ruth to become an Israelite.

In this dissertation there is an exegetical study of Deuteronomy 23:3–6 to determine the veracity of the law that excludes Moabite descendants. There is also a study of the important events in the book of Ruth to find an answer to the reaction of the people of Bethlehem to Ruth's marriage. Furthermore, there is a discussion of the theological implications of Ruth's acceptance into the assembly of the Lord, as well as an evaluation of the different views of Ruth's acceptance as an Israelite. This study concludes that King David's heritage was not invalidated by his Moabite ancestry because Ruth was accepted into the Jewish community. God sovereignly used the redemption and levirate laws to qualify Ruth as the wife of Boaz. As a result of this, the people of Bethlehem accepted her as their own and God blessed the couple by providing a son.

David E. Cooper – *The Macroplot of Genesis as Structurally Developed Through Episodic and Toledot Contributions: An Intersection of Discourse Analysis and Plot Analysis*

Abstract: Through the intersection of discourse analysis and plot analysis, a proposed macroplot for Genesis is developed from the formal structure of the narrative. The macrostructure of Genesis is determined to consist of eleven sections marked by transitional toledot headings. These headings are further stratified by their conjunctive or asyndetic form resulting in an outline for Genesis which includes five main sections and six sub-sections. From this structural starting point, a clause-by-clause discourse analysis ensues demarking these main sections and sub-sections according to their episodes. Each episode is then examined in order to reveal its specific contextual plot contribution. This analysis reveals that each main toledot traces a lineage of promise introduced in Genesis 3 throughout the incumbent narrative by repetition of the plot elements 1) threat to the promised line, 2) hope of God's means of resolution, 3) promise extended to the subject of the next main toledot, and 4) God's reassurance of promise. Through synthesis of each episode's plot contribution into the macroplot of Genesis, it is concluded that Genesis records the story of God's relationship with mankind to whom He delegates the blessing-commission. This commission consists of the responsibility of reflecting God's image through their relationships to each other, to the earth, and to the animal kingdom. Despite the disobedience of mankind to this commission, God extends a promise of completion through the progeny of mankind. This line of progeny is traced through the narrative including various threats and tensions. Rather than reject mankind's role as delegated representative, God responds to the threats and tensions with promise and reassurance. As the line of promise is narrowed through each main toledot section, the promise itself is expanded to include the promises of a multitude of descendants, a land, and the role of blessing to other nations. Each representative of the promised line experiences these blessings to some degree contributing to hope for fulfillment, yet their fulfillment is not reached within the

narrative. The narrative therefore ends with anticipation for the fulfillment of the promises of God to the line of promise.

— *New Testament* —

John Vo — *Paul's Ethics of Ethnic Reconciliation: Reading Ephesians 4-6 in Light of Ephesians 2:11-22*

Abstract: Ephesians 2:11–22 is regarded by most scholars as the theological center of Ephesians. The theme of ethnic reconciliation is clearly exhibited in the passage. The ethics of Ephesians in chapters 4–6 is grounded in the doctrinal section of chapters 1–3. Given the relationship between Ephesians 1–3 and 4–6, the ethics of Ephesians 4–6 would seem to find its theological grounding in Ephesians 2:11–22. Namely, the “one another” ethics in Ephesians 4–6 would be grounded in the theological context of ethnic reconciliation. The authorial intent application of the “one another” ethics is specific to the process of ethnic reconciliation that Christ has accomplished. In other words, the “one another” ethics throughout Ephesians 4–6 has in mind the exhortation to Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians to be united in Christ since they are now one social community, i.e., the church. Although Ephesians addresses multiple theological and practical issues, one of the primary occasions that caused Paul to write Ephesians is the ethnic conflict between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. The theological center of Ephesians 2:11–22 and the practical ethics of ethnic reconciliation in Ephesians 4–6 ought to be viewed as Paul’s primary, if not main concern, for Ephesians.

— *Systematic Theology* —

Daniel Wiley — *A Critical Evaluation of Progressive Parallelism*

Abstract: Progressive parallelism is a structural approach to the book of Revelation which states that the Apocalypse is arranged as a series of vision cycles. Each of these cycles (covering 3–4 chapters) addresses roughly the same chronological period (generally the time between the first and second coming of

Christ) but each successive cycle extends further into the future and describes key eschatological events and themes in greater detail than addressed in previous cycles. Progressive parallelism serves as a valuable defense of amillennialism. If progressive parallelism proves exegetically sound, then one can argue that Revelation 20:1 begins a new cycle and describes events immediately following the first coming of Christ, thus demonstrating that the millennium is not a future kingdom on earth that consummates following the second coming of Christ, but rather describes the reign of the saints during the present age.

To prove legitimacy of progressive parallelism, proponents offer various evidences, including so-called consummative judgment and salvation at the end of each vision cycle, the parallels between the seals, trumpets, and bowls judgments, and the thematic relationships between Revelation 12 and 20, as well as chapters 19 and 20. These evidences, although appearing valid and coherent, suffer from poor exegesis of key texts, inconsistency in applying standards to prove recapitulation, and frequent appeals to an unfalsifiable “eschatological progression” to explain away exegetical difficulties. Therefore, progressive parallelism does not successfully defend amillennialism.