Jurnal VOICE Volume 6, No 1, 2026
P-ISSN: 2774-4752 E-ISSN: 2775-264X
Available online at: https://ojs.sttbk.ac.id/index.php/teologi/index

Calling in Context: Relational Fracture and Divine Initiative in Genesis

Henry Darmawan
Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Baptis Kalvari
asenhd.mc@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Divine calling is often framed within coherent and purpose-driven models that emphasize clarity and fulfillment. Yet, such approaches tend to overlook the disruptive relational contexts in which calling is discerned. This study examines the role of relational fracture in the formation of calling, focusing on sibling narratives in Genesis. Using a biblical-theological approach with a narrative-critical orientation, the study analyzes the accounts of Cain and Abel, Jacob and Esau, and Joseph and his brothers. The findings demonstrate that relational fracture does not function as a formative mechanism of calling, but as a revelatory and destabilizing condition that exposes how individuals respond to divine initiative. The same condition of fracture produces divergent outcomes—distortion in Cain, transformation in Jacob, and providential formation in Joseph—indicating that suffering does not possess inherent formative power. Instead, the outcome is determined by the dynamic interplay between divine initiative and human response. This study contributes to a more precise theological framework by redefining relational fracture as a revelatory condition rather than a formative process, offering a nuanced understanding of calling that is grounded in biblical narrative and responsive to the complexity of human experience.

Keywords: divine calling, relational fracture, spiritual formation, Genesis, biblical theology

INTRODUCTION

The concept of divine calling occupies a central place in Christian theology, often associated with purpose, direction, and intentionality within the life of faith. In many contemporary discussions on vocation, calling is frequently framed in coherent, progressive, and purpose-driven narratives[1][2], emphasizing clarity, affirmation, and fulfillment. While such perspectives offer constructive insights, they may inadvertently overlook the complex and often disruptive realities through which calling is discerned and formed. Biblical narratives, particularly within the book of Genesis, present a more textured portrayal of calling—one that unfolds not in ideal conditions, but within contexts marked by relational tension, moral failure, and familial conflict.[3][4]

Among these, sibling relationships emerge as a recurring locus of fracture, where jealousy, betrayal, favoritism, and violence shape the lived experience of individuals who are nevertheless situated within the unfolding purposes of God.[5] Despite the prominence of such narratives, limited attention has been given to the theological significance of sibling conflict as a formative context for calling. Existing discussions on vocation tend to emphasize divine initiative and personal

[1] Dallas Willard, *The Divine Conspiracy* (HarperCollins, 1998), 45.
[2] N. T. Wright, *After You Believe* (HarperOne, 2010), 23.
[3] Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis* (John Knox Press, 1982), 67.
[4] John H. Walton, *Genesis* (Zondervan, 2001), 102.
[5] Danna Nolan Fewell, "The Narrative Work of Biblical Children: Soundings from Genesis," in *Children and Methods*, Brill, 2020.

response,[6] yet often underdeveloped the role of relational brokenness as a site of spiritual formation.[78]

This paper seeks to address this gap by exploring how sibling conflict functions within the process of calling and spiritual formation. The central research question guiding this study is: How does relational fracture, particularly in sibling relationships, contribute to—or hinder—the formation and discernment of divine calling? Adopting a biblical-theological approach, this study examines selected Genesis narratives—Cain and Abel, Jacob and Esau, and Joseph and his brothers—to identify patterns of fracture, response, and divine engagement. It argues that while relational brokenness does not generate calling, it serves as a critical arena in which calling is revealed, tested, and refined. In doing so, this paper offers a constructive theological contribution that both retrieves the complexity of biblical witness and provides a critical lens for evaluating simplified contemporary understandings of calling.

METHOD

This study employs a biblical-theological approach to examine the relationship between relational fracture and the formation of divine calling. Rather than conducting empirical analysis, the research engages in a close reading of selected biblical texts within their literary, canonical, and theological contexts. The primary texts analyzed are drawn from the book of Genesis, focusing on three key sibling narratives: Cain and Abel (Gen. 4), Jacob and Esau (Gen. 25–33), and Joseph and his brothers (Gen. 37–50). These narratives are selected due to their representative portrayal of relational conflict and their theological significance within the broader biblical canon.[910]The method involves two interrelated movements. First, an exegetical analysis is conducted to identify narrative patterns of conflict, human response, and divine involvement.[11] Second, a theological synthesis is developed to interpret how these patterns contribute to a broader understanding of calling and spiritual formation. This approach allows the study to move beyond descriptive analysis toward constructive theological reflection, situating individual narratives within the larger framework of biblical theology.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the biblical-theological analysis by examining selected sibling narratives in Genesis as representative case studies of relational fracture. In the context of this study, "results" do not refer to empirical findings, but to patterns and theological insights that emerge from close textual engagement with the biblical narratives. The analysis proceeds by exploring three key accounts—Cain and Abel, Jacob and Esau, and Joseph and his brothers—each representing distinct trajectories of relational fracture. These narratives are examined comparatively to identify how conflict functions differently depending on the nature of human response and divine engagement. Through this approach, the discussion seeks to demonstrate that relational fracture does not operate uniformly in the formation of calling. Rather, it may lead to

[6] Miroslav Volf, *Work in the Spirit* (Oxford University Press, 2001), 89.
[7] M. Robert Mulholland, *Invitation to a Journey* (IVP, 1993), 45.
[8] James K. A. Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom* (Baker Academic, 2009), 112.
[9] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (Basic Books, 1981), 34.
[10] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Indiana University Press, 1985), 56.
[11] Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "Tipping the Balance: Sternberg's Reader and the Rape of Dinah," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110, no. 2 (1991): 193–211.

distortion, transformation, or providential refinement, depending on the interplay between human agency and divine initiative.

Cain and Abel: Fracture without Transformation

The narrative of Cain and Abel (Gen. 4:1–16) presents the earliest instance of sibling conflict within the biblical canon, establishing a foundational pattern of relational fracture marked by jealousy, rejection, and violence. Unlike later narratives in Genesis, this account notably lacks any redemptive resolution within the relational dynamic itself, making it a critical point of departure for examining how fracture relates to the formation—or distortion—of calling.

The conflict emerges within the context of worship, where both brothers present offerings to God. The text indicates that Abel's offering is regarded favorably, while Cain's is not (Gen. 4:4–5). Significantly, the narrative provides no explicit rationale for this divine preference, thereby shifting interpretive attention away from ritual form toward the offerer's disposition.[12] This ambiguity becomes the catalyst for Cain's internal disorientation, described in terms of anger and a fallen countenance, signaling a fracture that begins not externally but within the human interior.

At this juncture, the narrative introduces a decisive theological moment: divine engagement before human failure. God addresses Cain directly, issuing both a warning and an invitation to moral agency: "sin is crouching at the door; its desire is for you, but you must rule over it" (Gen. 4:7). The Hebrew verb translated as "crouching," רָבַץ (*rābaṣ*), evokes the image of a predatory animal lying in wait, suggesting that sin is not merely a passive condition but an active and imminent threat.[13] The phrase "its desire is for you" employs the term תְּשׁוּקָה (*těšûqāh*), which also appears in Genesis 3:16, indicating a relational dynamic characterized by tension and the impulse toward domination. In this sense, sin is portrayed as seeking to control Cain, positioning him within a contested moral space. Crucially, the divine command "you must rule over it" utilizes the verb מָשַׁל (*māšal*), denoting governance or mastery. This imperative underscores the presence of genuine human responsibility: despite the reality of internal fracture and external temptation, Cain is neither portrayed as helpless nor predetermined in his response. The narrative thus frames fracture not as an inevitable pathway to destruction, but as a moment of decision in which the possibility of resistance remains open.

Cain's subsequent action—murdering his brother—reveals a failure to exercise this moral agency. The fracture escalates from internal disorder to irreversible violence, marking the first instance of fratricide in the biblical account. Importantly, this progression is not depicted as the unavoidable consequence of emotional distress, but as the outcome of disregarded divine instruction. The presence of a fracture, therefore, does not inherently produce transformation; rather, its trajectory is contingent upon human response to divine engagement. Following the act, God again confronts Cain, initiating a dialogue that exposes both the gravity of the offense and the persistence of divine involvement. Yet Cain's response centers not on repentance but on the burden of punishment (Gen. 4:13–14), further confirming the absence of transformative movement. The narrative concludes with exile and alienation, reinforcing the destructive potential of unresolved fracture.

From a theological perspective, this account functions as a critical counter-example within the broader argument of this study. While relational fracture is undeniably present, it does not lead to the formation of calling. Instead, it results in the distortion of human vocation—from stewardship of life to its destruction. The decisive factor lies not in the existence of conflict, but in the absence of a responsive alignment to divine initiative. Consequently, the narrative of Cain and Abel establishes an essential boundary condition: relational brokenness, in itself, does not

[12] John H. Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One* (IVP Academic, 2015), 110.
[13] Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 70.

generate calling and may, in fact, undermine it. Any theological framework that assumes suffering or conflict inherently produces growth must therefore be critically reassessed in light of this text.

Jacob and Esau: Fracture and Transformative Encounter

The narrative of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 25:19–33; 27:1–45; 32:1–33:17) presents a more complex form of relational fracture, one that unfolds over time and is deeply intertwined with issues of identity,[14] inheritance, and divine promise. Unlike the account of Cain and Abel, this narrative does not culminate in immediate destruction, but neither does it offer a simplistic resolution. Instead, it portrays fracture as a prolonged condition that becomes the context for transformation. The conflict originates in the prenatal oracle, where divine declaration establishes a reversal of conventional order: "the older shall serve the younger" (Gen. 25:23). This pronouncement introduces tension at the level of identity and destiny even before the brothers are born. The subsequent narrative developments—Jacob's acquisition of the birthright and the deception of Isaac—intensify this tension, embedding fracture within both relational and moral dimensions. Jacob emerges not merely as a recipient of promise, but as an active participant in manipulation, raising critical questions regarding the relationship between divine election and human agency. As the conflict escalates, Esau's response is marked by the intention to kill his brother (Gen. 27:41), echoing the earlier pattern seen in the narrative of Cain. However, the trajectory diverges at this point. Rather than resulting in immediate violence, the fracture leads to Jacob's exile, initiating a prolonged period of displacement and vulnerability. This shift is significant: fracture does not culminate in destruction, but becomes the condition through which transformation begins to unfold.

The turning point of the narrative occurs in Genesis 32, where Jacob encounters[15] a mysterious divine figure at Peniel. The text describes this encounter using the verb אָבַק (*ʾābaq*), "to wrestle," a rare term that conveys intense physical and existential struggle. This moment is not merely symbolic, but represents a profound confrontation in which Jacob's identity is contested and reconfigured. The renaming of Jacob as "Israel" signifies a transformation that is both personal and theological, marking a shift from self-reliance toward dependence upon divine blessing. This transformative encounter also introduces a critical reorientation of Jacob's identity that directly impacts his relational posture. Before this moment, Jacob consistently operated through strategy, manipulation, and self-preservation. His actions toward Esau, Isaac, and even Laban reveal a pattern in which relational fracture is both experienced and perpetuated through human initiative.

However, the encounter at Peniel disrupts this pattern at its core. The renaming of Jacob to Israel is not merely symbolic, but indicative of a shift in identity from one who grasps and deceives to one who struggles and depends. This shift becomes evident in his subsequent approach to Esau, where Jacob adopts a posture of humility rather than control (Gen. 33:3). The narrative thus suggests that transformation is not located in the resolution of external conflict alone, but in the reconfiguration of the self in relation to God.

The reconciliation with Esau does not erase the history of fracture, nor does it imply full restoration of relational harmony. The brothers part ways shortly after their encounter, indicating that transformation does not necessarily lead to complete relational resolution. This nuance further supports the argument that calling and formation are not contingent upon ideal relational outcomes, but upon the transformation of the individual before God. This transformation does not erase the prior fracture, but reorients Jacob's posture toward it. When Jacob finally encounters Esau again (Gen. 33), the anticipated violence is replaced by an unexpected reconciliation. Yet the narrative does not present this resolution as the direct product of Jacob's strategy or moral improvement. Rather, it suggests that the transformation experienced in the divine encounter has altered Jacob's

[14] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 78.
[15] John Goldingay, *Old Testament Theology: Israel's Faith* (IVP Academic, 2015), 210.

disposition, enabling a different mode of relational engagement. From a theological perspective, this narrative illustrates that relational fracture can function as a context for transformation when it is accompanied by a genuine encounter with the divine. Unlike the case of Cain, where divine warning is disregarded, Jacob's story demonstrates a trajectory in which fracture leads to confrontation, and confrontation opens the possibility of transformation.

Nevertheless, it is crucial to maintain a critical distinction: the transformative outcome is not inherent in the fracture itself. The conflict between Jacob and Esau does not automatically produce growth; rather, transformation emerges through a process marked by exile, struggle, and divine intervention. Without these elements, the fracture remains unresolved and potentially destructive. This account, therefore, contributes a necessary nuance to the broader argument of this study. While relational brokenness does not generate calling, it may serve as a formative arena when mediated through divine encounter and responsive transformation. In this sense, calling is not born out of fracture, but may be clarified and deepened through the process of engaging it under the shaping influence of divine initiative.

Joseph and His Brothers: Fracture as Providential Formation

The narrative of Joseph and his brothers (Gen. 37–50) represents the most extensive and theologically developed account of sibling fracture in Genesis. Unlike the preceding narratives, this account spans multiple stages of suffering, displacement, and eventual elevation, offering a complex portrayal of how relational brokenness may intersect with divine purpose over time.

The fracture begins with jealousy intensified by paternal favoritism and Joseph's dreams, which are perceived by his brothers as a threat to the established hierarchy (Gen. 37:3–11). This tension escalates into betrayal, as Joseph is sold into slavery—a decisive act that not only severs relational bonds but also removes him from his familial and covenantal context. At this stage, the narrative presents no immediate indication that the fracture serves any constructive purpose; rather, it functions as a destructive act rooted in envy and hostility.

However, a distinctive feature of this narrative is the recurring theological motif that "the LORD was with Joseph" (Gen. 39:2, 21).[16] This repeated affirmation introduces a crucial dimension absent in the case of Cain and only partially visible in the story of Jacob: the sustained presence of God within the process of suffering. Importantly, this divine presence does not prevent hardship—Joseph experiences slavery, false accusation, and imprisonment—but accompanies him through it. The significance of this motif lies in its reconfiguration of the meaning of fracture. The narrative does not suggest that the betrayal itself is good or necessary; rather, it portrays God as actively working within and through intrinsically unjust circumstances. This distinction is essential in avoiding a deterministic or romanticized interpretation of suffering.

The interpretive climax of the narrative occurs in Joseph's retrospective theological reflection: "You intended evil against me, but God intended it for good" (Gen. 50:20). This statement does not collapse human intention into divine will, but maintains a clear distinction between the two. The brothers' actions remain unequivocally evil, while God's intention operates on a different level, redirecting the outcome toward preservation and life. Furthermore, Joseph's capacity to reinterpret his past reflects a significant dimension of spiritual formation—namely, the ability to perceive divine activity without negating the reality of human wrongdoing. His statement does not trivialize the suffering he endured, nor does it suggest that the actions of his brothers were necessary or justified. Instead, it articulates a dual-layered understanding of history in which human intention and divine purpose coexist without collapsing into one another. This interpretive maturity is not immediate but emerges over time, shaped by prolonged exposure to suffering and sustained awareness of divine presence. The narrative progression—from the pit to the prison, and

[16] Goldingay, *Old Testament Theology: Israel's Faith*, 215.

eventually to the palace—functions not merely as a sequence of events, but as a formative journey in which Joseph's character, discernment, and leadership are developed.

Moreover, Joseph's response to his brothers upon their reunion demonstrates that formation is evidenced not only in personal insight but in relational action. Rather than perpetuating the cycle of retribution, Joseph embodies a posture of restraint, forgiveness, and provision. This indicates that the formation of calling is inseparable from ethical transformation, particularly in the realm of restored relationships. From a theological standpoint, this introduces the concept of providential formation. Unlike the immediate moral failure of Cain or the crisis-driven transformation of Jacob, Joseph's formation unfolds through a prolonged process in which divine presence, rather than a singular encounter, becomes the defining factor. The narrative suggests that calling is not revealed in a moment alone, but is shaped over time through endurance, faithfulness, and reinterpretation of past suffering. Nevertheless, it is critical to resist the conclusion that fracture is inherently formative. The narrative itself preserves the moral weight of injustice and does not justify the actions of Joseph's brothers. What distinguishes this account is not the presence of fracture, but the sustained activity of God within it, coupled with Joseph's eventual capacity to interpret his experience through a theological lens. In this sense, the story of Joseph contributes a climactic dimension to the argument of this study. Relational fracture, while destructive in origin, may become a context for the formation of calling when it is enveloped within divine and engaged through faithful response. However, the formative outcome cannot be attributed to the fracture itself, but to the redemptive work of God operating within and beyond it.

Theological Synthesis: Fracture, Divine Initiative, and the Formation of Calling

The comparative analysis of the Genesis narratives reveals that relational fracture functions neither as a uniform catalyst for transformation nor as an inherently formative element in the development of divine calling.[17] Rather, the examined accounts demonstrate a differentiated pattern in which similar conditions of fracture yield divergent outcomes, depending on the interplay between divine initiative and human response. In the case of Cain, fracture emerges within a context of divine engagement but results in moral collapse. Despite receiving a direct warning, Cain fails to respond appropriately, allowing internal disorder to culminate in violence. Here, fracture does not lead to formation, but to the distortion of human vocation. This establishes a critical theological boundary: the presence of relational tension or suffering does not, in itself, generate growth or calling.

The narrative of Jacob introduces a more complex dynamic. Fracture leads not to immediate destruction, but to prolonged crisis, exile, and eventual divine encounter. Transformation occurs not as a direct product of the fracture, but through a decisive moment of engagement with God that reconfigures Jacob's identity. This suggests that fracture may serve as a context in which the need for transformation is exposed, but it is the divine encounter that renders transformation possible. In the account of Joseph, the relationship between fracture and calling is further developed through the theme of divine providence.[18] Unlike the singular encounter experienced by Jacob, Joseph's formation unfolds through sustained divine presence within prolonged suffering. The narrative emphasizes that while human actions remain morally accountable, divine intention operates concurrently, redirecting the outcome toward preservation and life. This introduces a crucial distinction between the origin of suffering and the redemptive use of it. Taken together, these narratives support a theological framework in which relational fracture is best understood not as the source of calling, but as a contingent arena in which calling may be distorted, resisted, or refined. The decisive factor lies in the dynamic interaction between

[17] Christopher J. H. Wright, *The Mission of God's People* (Zondervan, 2016), 98.
[18] Terence E. Fretheim, *God and World in the Old Testament* (Abingdon, 2005), 145.

divine initiative and human response.[19] Fracture exposes the human condition—revealing tendencies toward envy, control, fear, and self-preservation—but does not determine the outcome. It is within this exposed condition that divine engagement becomes either resisted or received.

This synthesis challenges contemporary tendencies to interpret suffering as inherently purposeful or formative. While Scripture affirms that God can work through suffering, it does not suggest that suffering itself is intrinsically generative of calling. To assume otherwise risks collapsing the distinction between human evil and divine intention, thereby obscuring both moral responsibility and the nature of divine providence. At the same time, this framework offers a constructive theological insight: calling is often discerned not in the absence of fracture, but in the midst of it. However, its formation depends not on the fracture itself, but on the transformative work of God and the responsiveness of the human subject. In this sense, calling emerges through a process marked by tension, exposure, and reorientation, rather than linear progression or immediate clarity.

Implications for Theology of Calling and Spiritual Formation

The findings of this study carry significant implications for contemporary theology of calling, particularly in contexts where vocation is often framed in terms of clarity, success, and personal fulfillment. [20]The biblical patterns observed challenge such assumptions by demonstrating that calling is frequently discerned within contexts of ambiguity, disruption, and relational tension.

First, this study suggests that theological frameworks that equate calling with linear progression or uninterrupted growth fail to account for the complexity of biblical witness. The narratives examined reveal that calling may emerge through processes that involve delay, disorientation, and even moral failure. This calls for a reexamination of prevailing models that prioritize certainty over formation. Second, the analysis highlights the importance of maintaining a distinction between suffering as context and suffering as cause. While God may work within situations of fracture, the narratives do not support the conclusion that suffering is inherently necessary or desirable for the formation of calling. Such a distinction is essential to prevent the theological misinterpretation that pain is intrinsically redemptive. Third, the study underscores the role of human response in the formation of calling. Divine initiative is consistently present across the narratives, yet the outcomes differ significantly depending on whether this initiative is resisted, wrestled with, or embraced. This affirms that calling is not imposed upon passive subjects, but formed through active engagement with God. Finally, this framework invites a more pastoral and realistic approach to spiritual formation.[21] Rather than seeking to eliminate fracture or avoid relational tension, individuals may be guided to discern how such experiences function within a broader process of transformation. In this sense, calling is not discovered apart from life's complexities, but through a faithful navigation of them under the guidance of divine presence.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine how relational fracture, particularly within sibling relationships, functions in the formation and discernment of divine calling. Through a biblical-theological analysis of key Genesis narratives, it becomes evident that fracture does not operate as a uniform or inherently formative force. Instead, its role is contingent, shaped by the dynamic

[19] Volf, *Work in the Spirit*, 102.

[20] Brad E. Kelle, "Moral Injury and Biblical Studies: An Early Sampling of Research and Emerging Trends," *Currents in Biblical Research* 19, no. 2 (2021): 121–44.

[21] Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 125.

interplay between divine initiative[22] and human response. The narrative of Cain demonstrates that fracture, when met with resistance to divine engagement, results in moral collapse and the distortion of vocation. In contrast, the account of Jacob reveals that fracture may expose the need for transformation, but such transformation only occurs through decisive encounters with the divine. The story of Joseph further develops this pattern by showing that a prolonged fracture can become a context for the formation of a calling when accompanied by sustained divine presence and faithful response.

Taken together, these findings affirm that relational brokenness is neither the source nor the guarantee of calling. Rather, fracture serves as a revelatory context—exposing the human condition, intensifying moral and relational tensions, and creating space in which divine engagement becomes decisive. The formation of calling, therefore, cannot be attributed to suffering itself, but to the redemptive work of God operating within and beyond it. This conclusion challenges contemporary tendencies to equate calling with clarity, linear progression, or personal fulfillment. It also resists theological frameworks that implicitly romanticize suffering as inherently transformative. While Scripture affirms that God may work through contexts of fracture, it consistently maintains a distinction between human evil and divine purpose, preserving both moral accountability and the integrity of divine providence.

At the same time, this study offers a constructive theological contribution by reframing calling as a process shaped through tension, exposure, and reorientation. Calling is not merely discovered in moments of certainty but often discerned within the complexities of lived experience, where divine initiative confronts and reshapes human response. In this sense, relational fracture does not define the trajectory of calling, but it may become the arena in which that trajectory is clarified. It is not the fracture itself, but the encounter with God within the midst of it, that ultimately determines whether the calling is resisted, distorted, or faithfully embraced.

[22] Goldingay, *Old Testament Theology: Israel's Faith*, 220.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. Basic Books, 1981.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. John Knox Press, 1982.

Carr, David McLain. Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches. Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Fewell, Danna Nolan, and David M. Gunn. "Tipping the Balance: Sternberg's Reader and the Rape of Dinah." Journal of Biblical Literature 110, no. 2 (1991): 193–211.

Fewell, Danna Nolan. "The Narrative Work of Biblical Children: Soundings from Genesis." In Children and Methods. Brill, 2020.

Fretheim, Terence E. *God and World in the Old Testament*. Abingdon, 2005.

Goldingay, John. Old Testament Theology: Israel's Faith. IVP Academic, 2015.

Goldingay, John. *Old Testament Theology: Israel's Faith*. IVP Academic, 2015.

Kelle, Brad E. "Moral Injury and Biblical Studies: An Early Sampling of Research and Emerging Trends." Currents in Biblical Research 19, no. 2 (2021): 121–44.

Mulholland, M. Robert. *Invitation to a Journey*. IVP, 1993.

Smith, James K. A. *Desiring the Kingdom*. Baker Academic, 2009.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Indiana University Press, 1985.

Volf, Miroslav. *Work in the Spirit*. Oxford University Press, 2001.

Walton, John H. *Genesis*. Zondervan, 2001.

Walton, John H. *The Lost World of Genesis One*. IVP Academic, 2015.

Willard, Dallas. *The Divine Conspiracy*. HarperCollins, 1998.

Wright, Christopher J. H. *The Mission of God's People*. Zondervan, 2016.

Wright, N. T. *After You Believe*. HarperOne, 2010.