

wrong. Evidence is abundant, however, that antitrinitarianism was normative for Adventists until the 1890's. Froom might better have admitted the facts, then explained that many SDA's opposed trinitarianism, not so much because it elevated Christ above His "due status" as because (confused with a kind of monarchianism) it seemed to downgrade the Godhead to impersonality.

This reviewer, as a church historian and lifetime SDA, is disappointed to see Christ's special work in heaven since 1844 described chiefly as an act of judging. Froom has not grasped the developing significance of this heavenly ministry as it was understood by SDA's before and after 1888 and therefore has failed to explain that SDA's could be true Christians while not calling the cross the "atonement," and to show how 1888 was applied by many in the 1890's to total victory through Christ and the blotting out of sins. We await publication of Robert Haddock's 1970 Bachelor of Divinity thesis on the doctrine of the sanctuary, 1800-1915. Meanwhile we wonder if exclusive emphasis on the cross as the locus of a completed atonement is a theological or merely semantic advance and if it may not actually endanger a vital concept.

In short, *Movement of Destiny* is neither the last word on the history of SDA doctrines nor a perfect one; nonetheless, it is beyond doubt a substantial and stimulating work that will play an important role in the continuing quest for understanding of the SDA church.

Andrews University

C. MERVYN MAXWELL

Hamilton, Neill Q. *Jesus for a No-God World*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969. 203 pp. \$ 6.50.

This book is an attempt to argue for a secular Christianity that has a Biblical foundation. It is, therefore, only natural to be tempted to draw a comparison with Van Buren's *The Secular Meaning of the Gospel*. Unlike Van Buren, who outlines the Christological controversies of the first five centuries and the canons for meaning established by logical positivism in order to defend an existentialist view of Jesus that satisfies the questioning of modern philosophy and remains "orthodox," Hamilton wishes to argue for diversity within Christianity. According to him, the Christological controversies of the first Christian centuries, ironically, obscured the image that Jesus had of himself. But it just happens that precisely Jesus' own model is the one that may best serve those who live in a secular world.

Hamilton does not argue that this image is the only correct one, or the "true" one, but rather one which deserves to be brought to the forefront so that it may be a viable option among others already well known. But Hamilton maintains that critical historical investigation is what brings forth this image as the one that served Jesus in his self-identification. This image is one that derives its essential characteristics from Judaism and was later suffocated by Hellenistic Christianity, or so Hamilton thinks.

To reconstruct this lost tradition Hamilton embarks on a new quest for the historical Jesus. The result is the recovery of Jesus as the eschatological prophet, the only person with real flesh and blood at the core of the Gospel. He is set up over against the Kerygmatic Christ of the Resurrection narratives, whose reality is based on revelational experiences. It is important to observe here that the Gospel of Jn, where there is an explicit polemic against the Samaritan views of the Messiah as the eschatological prophet, is completely ignored by Hamilton. But he is quite correct in challenging the methodological presupposition of the New Quest that judges any statement ascribed to Jesus in the Gospel which has Jewish parallels to be *a priori* suspect. This represents a "particular cultural bias" which needs to be corrected. Hamilton makes the axiom read: "It is *safe* to predicate authenticity of any passage of the Gospels that deals with Jesus where there is agreement with contemporary Judaism" (p. 137, italics his). On the basis of this methodology Hamilton defends the interpretation of Jesus as the eschatological prophet over against competing Christologies because "it allows the historical Jesus to remain what he most certainly was—a Jew" (p. 136). Concerning the other Jewish Messianic images prominent at the time, Hamilton finds it impossible to think that the concept Son of Man could have been part of Jesus' self-consciousness because "there is no Jewish tradition prior to the resurrection that speaks of an earthly career for the apocalyptic Son of Man" (pp. 135, 136).

Hamilton's major contribution to the current debate is in his chapter on "The Resurrection of Jesus, The Composition of the Gospels, and the World to Come." Here he advances the argument that the Synoptic Gospels are not Passion stories with extended introductions, as Kähler characterized them at the turn of the century and everyone seems to have taken for granted ever since, but rather Resurrection stories with extended introductions, whose purpose is to apologize for this embarrassing impasse. The Pauline Gospel spiritualized the union of the believer and Christ in terms of Christ's resurrection. This vision of things immediately opened itself up to the extreme positions adopted by different brands of Gnosticism. The Gospels then attempted to deal with the reality of the resurrection in more concrete terms, in contrast to Paul's spiritual revelations and psychical bodies. Here each gospel has a particular interest in the resurrection and this may be recognized by the way in which each writer deals with the resurrection, and builds up to it in the extended introduction.

Hamilton gives rather original explanations for the writing of the Synoptics. Here he is in dialogue with the most significant voices in Gospel research. His voice carries the authority of home-work well done. The basic research on Mk was published originally in *JBL*, LXXXIV (1965), 415-421. Now he is extending the argument to Mt and Lk, and in so doing he strengthens it.

His basic argument is that the other-worldliness informing the

traditional understanding of Jesus is not essential for a recognition of Jesus' significance, and that therefore one may pledge allegiance to Jesus and what he stood for (as this may best be documented from the sources using historical methods) without having to accept the apocalyptic other-worldliness which informs the Gospels. It is of Persian origin anyway, and was amalgamated into Judaism as a means of dealing with the contradictions of history (as argued in Chapter I).

It is in the last chapter, "The Dawn of This World," where Hamilton works out his "hermeneutic of analogy" and his "process eschatology," that he becomes unconvincing. The substance of eschatology is provided by the behavioral sciences because the "convictional structure" of man today so demands. This means that the only agency in eschatology is the agency of man. "... man assumes the direct historical agency which God had in the traditional view. It is God's role to persuade man how he is to use that agency. In the older view man is waiting for God to arrange man's destiny. In the newer view God is waiting for man" (p. 186), which, it would seem to me, means that everyone is waiting for Godot.

Hamilton, in the final analysis, is looking for an alternative to Bultmann. He distinguishes his hermeneutic of analogy from demythologizing by claiming that his hermeneutic "allows the Biblical images to maintain their full stature" (p. 202). This is hard to see. Indeed, one may agree that Bultmann's hermeneutic is a reductionist one since it allows the Biblical images to speak only in terms of human existence. But Bultmann insists that the Gospel concerns God's actions, and he insists with vigor that the Christian must speak of God's action, even if only by analogy in terms of the Self and not apocalyptically or mythologically. Hamilton's No-God World based on social and political categories seems to constitute an even more drastic reduction of God's presence in this world. It has been reduced to the historical appearance of the man Jesus for a ministry of a few months.

Saint Mary's College
Notre Dame, Indiana

HEROLD WEISS

Halvorson, John V. *The Ages in Tension*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1970. 87 pp. \$ 1.95 (paperbound).

This book attempts to explain the problem of how to relate the new age in Christ with the old age of sin. It endeavors to tell how the Christian can be in the world and relevant to it, yet not of it.

Halvorson presents the two ages and shows how they are and must be in tension. As his main source he uses the Apostle Paul (Rom 5 in particular). Like Karl Barth in *Christ and Adam*, he compares Adam and Christ as being the first and second Adam, respectively, but does so without Barth's stress on the nature of man. Adam is the originator of the old or present age, while Christ is the founder and sustainer of the new age.