 Appropriately for a conservative survey, there is nothing daring or adventurous in this work. But readers needing a concise, sober, and basic coverage of the whole waterfront of NT studies will be well served by this well-established production.

Andrews University

Robert M. Johnston


The valuable three-volume reference work, *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, which is a translation and expansion of the *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, was provided with several indices, but a scriptural index was not one of them. Users accustomed to such an index in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* lamented its lack in the newer work.

The deficiency has now been remedied by two young scholars, with the help of that increasingly indispensable partner, the computer. The trio has even turned up a number of citation errors in the original work, and these are duly flagged in this index.

The index covers all references to the Jewish/Protestant canonical Scriptures, the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Josephus and Philo, the Apostolic Fathers, the Mishnah, and the Babylonian Talmud.

The volume comes in a soft binding and handy size, and it is clearly printed. Users of the *NIDNTT* will reach for this index often and with pleasure.

Andrews University

Robert M. Johnston


In this heavily documented volume (six chapters with 1,228 footnotes) Webster compares the christologies of four prominent Seventh-day Adven-
tist (hereinafter, SDA) writers: Ellen White, E. J. Waggoner, Edward Heppenstall, and Herbert Douglass (the first two from an earlier generation, and the last two being currently active as writers and lecturers). The book is the published form of Webster’s doctoral dissertation presented to the Theology Faculty of Stellenbosch University in the Cape Province of South Africa.

In chap. 1, the author provides background historical perspective and SDA orientation; chaps. 2-5 cover White (100 pages), Waggoner (90 pages), Heppenstall (98 pages) and Douglass (81 pages), respectively; and chap. 6 presents a summary and reflection. Webster divides his general treatment of christology into the following categories or schools of focus: (1) Ontological, (2) Speculative, (3) History of Jesus, (4) Existential, and (5) Functional. He places White and Heppenstall in the Ontological, Waggoner in the Speculative, and Douglass in the Functional schools. He finds the person of Christ to be the dominant factor for White, Waggoner, and Heppenstall; and he considers the work of Christ to be the dominating one for Douglass. He finds, further, the following christological motivations: (1) White's concern for God's character, (2) Waggoner's concern for the achievement of holiness in man, (3) Heppenstall's concern for objective salvation, and (4) Douglass's concern for Christlikeness. Man's natural sinful state, he suggests, is similarly and adequately emphasized by White, Waggoner, and Heppenstall, but insufficiently by Douglass. Finally, he notes the positive contribution made by each of these individuals to SDA thinking, as well as raising some questions.

Webster raises questions over Douglass’s christology. For example, if the standard of salvation is higher after probation’s close, is not this a sort of soteriological dispensationalism (p. 395)? Christianity, for Douglass, is reproducing Christ in the flesh, Webster asserts (p. 399); and therefore, has Douglass done credit to the uniqueness of Christ presented in the NT (p. 402)?

Webster finds a contrast between Douglass and White in that Douglass is preoccupied more with Jesus as an example than with the mystery of Christ's person (p. 407), whereas “Ellen White gives greatest prominence to Christ's substitutionary work” (p. 102). Also, whereas White says that there was in Jesus no “propensity,” Douglass find “propensity to sin” there, although not “propensity of sin” (p. 418; cf. pp. 126-133, where present study in Melvill [used by White] throws additional light on the statement that Jesus had “our humanity, but without sin”).

At this point, it may be well to take note of what appears to be one of Webster’s central theses, if not indeed his major thesis. He suggests that “it was precisely the exercising of all of the divine attributes that made the Incarnation possible both initially and at every successive moment, for it was only by the continual exercising of grace, freedom, love, omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence that God was able to dwell among us as
real Man without ceasing to be true God” (p. 451). No biblical support is
given for this thesis. Although I am sympathetic with Webster’s “thesis
purpose”—to be true to the full divinity of Christ—, what shall we say
about the biblical data suggesting a fuller kenosis? Webster questions
whether Heppenstall (p. 449) and Douglass (p. 382) are true to the kenosis;
but could not the same query be raised concerning his own view? Webster
questions whether Douglass is true to Scripture (pp., 406-412) and to Ellen
White (pp. 412-418); and again, one wonders if the same may not be raised
about his own understanding of the kenosis.

About his dissertation methodology Webster explains, “While some
Scriptural references will be used in presenting the Christology of our four
representatives, it will not be possible in the scope of this dissertation to
critically test these Christologies against his norm” (p. 5). Nevertheless, he
states rightly that “the ultimate norm to test any Christology must be the
Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments” (p. 5). Yet, he does not furnish
any biblical support for his understanding of the kenosis. Although one
must not be dogmatic when discussing this mystery (and Webster is not), it
is precisely the biblical data that seem to support White, Heppenstall, and
Douglass in their portrayal of a fuller kenosis. The question is this: Was
the man Jesus really omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent during his
human life? And do not a number of biblical data serve as a corrective to
Webster’s thesis (cf., e.g., Luke 2:52, Mark 13:22, Matt 8:10, and John
11:34, among many others)?

In addition to this central concern regarding Webster’s presentation
of the kenosis and his lack of sufficient attention to the biblical data in
this respect, I would suggest a few other, more-limited matters for
consideration:

1. In the listings of representatives within the various categories of
christologies he has set forth, Webster could well have included T. F.
Torrance among the Ontological Christologians and Hans Küng among
the Functional Christologians.

2. In connection with certain generalized statements, the addition of
names of a few specific individuals would have been helpful. An example
of such a statement is: “There are many in the church today who believe
that the contribution of E. J. Waggoner in the field of Christology is vital
for the church’s fresh understanding of its role and for the forward thrust
of the church as it seeks to fulfill its mission” (pp. 53-54). Who are some of
these “many in the church today”? 

3. On p. 342, there is a quotation from the jacket of Heppenstall’s
book The Man Who Is God. Would this not better have been omitted,
inasmuch as the words are not the author’s, but rather an editor’s?

In concluding his volume, Webster gives a very helpful summation,
with proposals. Perhaps his most significant observation here is that when
speaking of Christ's humanity, we must take care not to present him as altogether like one of us (pp. 448-449) and that it "is possible to hold to the priority of the substitutionary life, death and resurrection of Christ, while still holding to the power of the indwelling Christ and the importance of Christ's example" (p. 452). I would agree with him that these christologies await a more extensive biblical evaluation. In his words, "Such a study waits the attention and research of yet another seeker of truth" (p. 5).

Although expensive, this book is a must for anyone who wishes to understand better some of the central issues of current theological debate in the SDA church on the topic covered. In this respect, I feel that Webster has indeed made a valuable contribution.

Southern College of S. D. A. 
Collegedale, Tennessee

NORMAN GULLEY


In 1960 the theological schools of four Methodist related universities in the United States—Drew, Duke, Emory, and Southern Methodist—initiated the Wesley Works Editorial Project. Their aim was to publish the first critical edition of John Wesley's published and unpublished works.

Under the general editorship of Frank Baker, the various genre of Wesley's writings were assigned to unit editors. Several volumes were published by Oxford University Press, but severe economic problems compelled Oxford to announce its withdrawal from the project in 1982. Abingdon Press then offered its services to begin with the publication of the first of four volumes of Wesley's sermons in 1984, the bicentennial year of the formation of American Methodism as an autonomous church.

The unit editor for the sermons is Albert C. Outler, a scholar eminently qualified for the task. The initial volume of *Sermons* is divided into three parts. The first part is Outler's insightful one-hundred page introduction, which provides a focused biographical sketch, introduces Wesley as a preacher, highlights the role of preaching and the sermon in his life and thought, discusses the components of the corpus of Wesley's sermons, reviews his theological method, and surveys the large number and wide variety of sources used by Wesley.

"The chief aim and warrant for this edition of the extant sermons of John Wesley," writes Outler, "is to present them in reliable and readable