farfetched; only in one spot (p. 158) is there a suggestion that the "house where gods may dwell" is science. The subtitle at least could have been used to describe the content, which is the proposal of a Christian philosophy for social science.

In writing this book, Gaede undertook a challenge that has been a controversy of the ages. It is unrealistic to expect that he, or anyone else, could satisfactorily solve it. *Where Gods May Dwell*, however, is valuable as another Christian voice in the dialogue. It gives some creative insights and provokes thought, and can thus profit any Christian who wants seriously to examine the relationship between faith and science and the foundations upon which these rest.

Andrews University


The problem which Jerry Gladson deals with in this book goes beyond the mere academic world of reflections and information. The issue is not simply theological or philosophical, nor even exegetical, but rather one that concerns every one of us in daily life. It was to be expected, therefore, that the prologue which opens Gladson's study would draw its material from life—in this case, the unexpected and tragic death of a woman named Janet. Thus, we immediately immersed into a feeling of pain mixed with the consciousness of the overwhelming reality—"the abiding question"—of the meaning of suffering.

The author first considers briefly various attempts that have been made to deal with the question of theodicy. The Eastern view denies the reality of suffering. Augustine and Irenaeus assume it as a necessary condition—the former to guarantee freedom, the latter as a means to spiritual development. Process Philosophy sees the solution within a common struggle involving God, who runs the risk to love and thereby has no control at all over evil. Lastly, the "tragic view" interprets suffering as an inherent part of the human condition, meaningless and definitely pessimistic. Since none of these solutions "adequately explain" the problem of evil in God's world, Gladson turns to the book of Job, wherein the presumed solution will be reached.

Job, the victim of a "heavenly council" involving God and man, is crushed by successive trials which bereave him of all his wealth and children, and finally leave him sick and devastated. After some time of stoic submission, Job revolts and claims his innocence against God. His friends who had come to comfort him reject his view and contend that God cannot
be guilty, for suffering is interlocked with sin and cannot exist without sin. Their presentation follows a cycle. This cycle is revised by Gladson, who proposes what he considers to be a "more balanced structure": Eliphaz (chap. 22), Job (chaps. 23 and 24), Bildad (chaps. 25 and 26:5-14), Job (chaps. 26:1-4 and 27:1-12), and Zophar (chap. 27:13-23).

However alluring this new arrangement may be, it stumbles on the basis of the biblical text, which does not easily support this rearrangement. For instance, the passage in 26:5-14, which Gladson attributes to Bildad and not to Job as the MT suggests, relates to Job’s discourse in 26:1-4 in terms of questions and answers. Also, the fact that 27:13-23 is a plea for the retribution of the wicked does not necessarily mean that it should come from one of the friends rather than from Job, for Job himself shares the same view in a number of passages (29:18-20; 21:5, 16, 30-31). At any rate, all the friends defend the same basic position, each with his own emphasis. Eliphaz argues on the basis of his own subjective and personal experience, Bildad appeals to tradition, and Zophar to the mystery of God.

As for Elihu, the "intruder," he also emphasizes the mysterious power he perceives in the work of Creation. Thus his discourses, instead of being artificial later additions, pave the ground to the next (and last) part of the book of Job; and they therefore belong to the literary corpus of the book.

The divine speeches include the poetic section of the book and convey the final answer to Job’s problem. According to Gladson, these speeches elaborate three themes that provide the answer to human suffering: divine mystery, human limits, and divine presence. Thus, Gladson’s solution to the plan of suffering is twofold. It is existential because it is disclosed from within the experience of the divine-human encounter, and it is also ethical since the ultimate answer still lies in God’s hands. This tension indeed justifies the complexity of the problem. Yet, it is not certain whether Gladson has succeeded in conciliating the two apparently contradictory truths. It is also uncertain whether Gladson has really tackled the problem of suffering, since that problem remains unsolved.

Moreover, is it really certain that the need for a complete explanation for Job’s plight vanishes in light of the divine presence? The question, as Gladson perceives it, is to know indeed whether God’s comfort in the present life is answer enough for the problem of suffering. His thesis sounds quite theoretical, and one might also argue that on the contrary, the contact with the pure God might rather develop a perplexity towards evil in the suffering individual, thereby deepening that person’s pain and revolt.

On another side, the eschatological perspective in the book of Job seems to have escaped Gladson, who only hints at it in passing or deals with it too briefly (pp. 20, 68, 124). The reference to Creation in God’s discourses (chaps. 38-47), the explicit mention of Resurrection in 13:25-27, the strange heavenly scenery occurring in a special day (hayyom 1:6, 2:1; cf.
Rachi), and the presence of Satan in a context full of forensic terminology—all these elements may well indicate another direction in the interpretation of the book of Job.

Gladson's concern to provide an answer to suffering, already in existence, has led him to neglect the tragic dimension of suffering. Even the epilogue in the book of Job does not portray a complete restoration, for Job's former children are still dead. And the final problem of death for Job himself remains, as well, for the book ends with his death.

Gladson also ignores the philosophical contribution made by the tragic approach (p. 19). We may at least mention the after-war existentialist philosophy of Søren Kierkegaard and the philosophy of the absurd of Albert Camus and Maurice Friedman. Furthermore, it is not true that this tragic consciousness of human plight is rooted only in the "crisis of belief" proper to today's world. The Midrashim (Baba Bathra 14b, 17a), and the Zohar (1134a) have defended the position long before the modern movement—and this without questioning God's existence.

Indeed, the problem which Gladson engages is complex. Therefore a sharp, clear, and definitive answer would be suspect. Gladson never traps himself by using dogmatic statements. Rather, by means of simple language that is always in touch with concrete life, he follows the book of Job step by step, providing his reader with many insights along the way.

This volume is worth reading, as it appeals for humility with regard to one of the most complex issues of human life. And valuable too is the challenge that it gives to further thinking and research.

Andrews University

Jacques Doukhán


*Sing a New Song* is only the second book written that deals with worship by and for Seventh-day Adventists. By the paucity of publishing on this subject, it may be concluded that the subject is unworthy of consideration, that the Adventist Church is so well informed and practices such beautiful and meaningful services of worship that writing about worship is unnecessary, or that the church and particularly the ministry lacks enough interest in the subject of worship to make it a priority or even a minor concern. A lack of concern for practical and effective worship has been obvious in a variety of ways in most Adventist worship services, at least in North America.

What is the meaning of worship? How is worship to be conducted in order to make it consequential to the congregation? What elements of