

so-called "religious" sphere. The modern dualism between secularity and religion is transferred to the biblical materials where both spheres are inseparable. These distinctions blur the understanding of the biblical idea of the remnant.

Preuss's very useful 30-page "Addition" seeks to trace the influence of Müller's thoughts on later OT scholarship. He shows how scholars from 1939 to the present such as G. von Rad, E. Jacob, O. Kaiser, H. Gross, J. Nelis, H.-P. Müller, W. H. Schmidt, U. Stegemann, etc., have (uncritically) taken over Müller's notions, especially the political origin of the remnant idea and the distinction between the "secular-political" and "religious" spheres. However, Preuss points out that in view of the reviewer's study referred to above, these notions are not only called into question but must be given up (pp. 17, 113-116, 126). Unfortunately Preuss did not have available the dissertation of D. M. Warne (1958) on the origin, development, and significance of the OT idea of the remnant and the thesis of R. Hoshizaki (1955) on the Isaianic concept of the remnant. It is surprising that no reference is made to I. Engnell, J. Lindblom, and others writing in English. It seems that my study "Semantic Values of Derivatives of the Hebrew Root *Š'R*," *AUSS* 11 (1973): 152-169, appeared too late for inclusion in Preuss's "Addition."

This reprint will be valued for making available a rare German dissertation whose conclusions unfortunately were uncritically adopted by most German scholars for over three decades. The "Addition" will bring the reader fairly up-to-date with regard to more recent literature.

Andrews University

GERHARD F. HASEL

Ozanne, G. C. *The First 7000 Years*. Jericho, N.Y.: Exposition Press, 1970. 227 pp. \$5.00.

The first ten chapters of this book deal with Biblical chronology from Adam to Christ while the last two are more concerned with numerology, a typology developed from the preceding chronology. Nine of the ten chapters on chronology deal with the OT, starting with Genesis and ending with Nehemiah.

From Gn 1 to I Ki 1 (Adam to Solomon) the author has outlined a relatively reasonable chronology from a conservative viewpoint. The most controversial point in this part of his presentation is his use of the genealogies in Gn 5 and 11 for precise historico-chronological conclusions.

For his work on the divided monarchy Ozanne rejects all synchronisms with Assyria. He admits that these present a problem for his system, but he does not feel competent to deal with them since he is not an Assyriologist. He is confident, however, that when such materials are correctly understood they will come into harmony with his system of Biblical chronology. His objection seems somewhat unusual in view of the fact that he uses Nebuchadnezzar's chronicles, also Assyriological materials, to provide his terminal date for the Hebrew monarchy. The result from this approach is that Ozanne comes out with a rather long chronology for the period from Jehu to the fall of Samaria, a period for which Assyrian synchronisms are available. This in turn produces high dates for preceding events: the division of the

kingdom, 968; the accession of Solomon, 1008; David's installation, 1048; the Exodus, 1484. All of these are at least 40 years higher than almost anyone currently would date them.

After discussing the 70 years of exile in chapter 8, Ozanne proceeds to the 70 weeks of Dan 9. He dates the going forth of the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem to the 20th year of Artaxerxes I in 445 when Nehemiah received his commission. Accepting the day-year principle, there are 483 years (69 weeks) from that date down to Christ. Since this computation comes out too late, Ozanne reduces each of the 483 years by 5 days by taking them as lunar-solar prophetic years. This reduction brings the end of the 69th week back to A.D. 32, which is the year to which Ozanne dates Christ's crucifixion. He considers very unlikely the suggestion that this period may have started earlier with Ezra. Ozanne's work on the chronology of the birth, baptism, ministry, and death of Christ (chap. 10) simply has not come to grips with the problems involved, as he himself admits in the last instance.

Following futurist and dispensationalist interpretation, Ozanne puts the 70th week of Dan 9 down at the end of the age, just prior to the commencement of the millennium. In contrast to other interpreters of this school, however, Ozanne provides dates for these events. He derives these dates from three lines of evidence: (1) his interpretation of the figures in apocalyptic passages in the Bible; (2) numerology, i.e., the number of years from Adam to the foundation of the temple equals the number from the founding of the temple to the beginning of the millennium, etc.; (3) the schematic outline of 6000 years of human history followed by the millennium, whence the title for his work. Since he dates Creation at 4004 B.C. and Christ's birth 4000 years later at 4 B.C., human history as we know it will terminate in A.D. 1996 when the millennium begins. The 70th week will begin seven years before that, in 1989, but this is not synonymous with Christ's coming, as the rapture takes place prior to 1989. On the basis of these principles, it is difficult to take Ozanne seriously. He has moved out of serious scholarship into speculation.

An intimate part of Ozanne's system is that the Sabbath is a type of the millennium. To support such an interpretation he draws upon the usual texts that mention that a thousand years are as but a day with the Lord. Two observations are offered on this point to close this review. First, the Sabbath appears in the OT as the fourth of ten stipulations upon which the covenant between Yahweh and Israel was based. Nothing could be further from a prophetic or typological context. The Sabbath is cited there as a memorial of Creation, and later it is referred to as a memorial of the Exodus. In Heb 4, which Ozanne mentions, the Sabbath does not prefigure the millennium but refers to the Christian's rest in Christ. Secondly, as Ozanne also notes, the day-age concept was present both in late pre-Christian Jewish thought and in Christian teaching as early as the Apostolic Fathers, in the Epistle of Barnabas. This interpretation does not appear in the NT, however. It later led to the failure of hopes for Christ's return around A.D. 500 and again around A.D. 1000, since Christians then used the LXX for the figures upon which they based their calculations. For details the reader is referred to *AUSS* 4 (1966): 166-168.