

Doukhan, Jacques. *Daniel: The Vision of the End*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987. ix + 182 pp. Paperback, \$12.95.

Jacques Doukhan's work on the book of Daniel reflects a good deal of effort and investigation. Attempting both a scholarly and a "spiritual" treatment of Daniel's "vision of the end," he probes into some of the mysteries and marvels of this OT apocalypse with an eye on literary, historical, prophetic, theological, and existential dimensions.

Doukhan organizes his writing with particular attention to four major "visions" in the book of Daniel. Following a brief introduction in which he lays out his understanding of the eschatological nature of the book and his methodology, he distinguishes among visions of (1) judgment (Dan 2, 7-8, 9), (2) waiting (Dan 12, Rev 14), (3) war (Dan 11, Rev 16), and (4) Michael (Dan 12). The first three visions form the backbone of his concern and serve as the platform from which he launches into discussions of history and eschatology, hope and despair, and the cosmic conflict between God and the forces of darkness.

Chapter 1, dealing with a vision of judgment, draws together the past and the present/future by means of a synthetic reading of the biblical chapters which involve the statue, beasts, and judgment scenes and times. In quite easy fashion, Doukhan links events and predictions from Daniel's time by means of *Yom Kippur* terminology and symbolism to the final epoch of the Christian era, climaxing in the *parousia*. Preceding this conclusion to world history, a period of judgment occurs, in which, as on the Day of Atonement, lines of distinction are drawn between those who repent and the recalcitrant wicked.

Chapter 2 emphasizes the importance of patience while awaiting the *parousia* by outlining and carefully detailing the time prophecies in Daniel and showing exactly how each finds fulfillment in historical events through modern times. Daniel 11 provides the starting point for chapter 3, which concentrates on a vision of war. Here our author marks out a "spiritual" interpretation of the conflict between the kings of the North and South which demonstrates the nature of war and God's role in judgment. Throughout, Doukhan is anxious to stress (and does so especially in the final chapter) the central focus on "the end" in the book of Daniel and to draw from that a sense of respect for judgment and responsibility, a feeling of human dignity, and hope for the future. We are not told, however, exactly how Daniel's ancient readers were to maintain hope in the face of the more than 2,000 years yet to elapse.

Doukhan's 113 pages of text are followed by 37 pages of notes, 2 charts chronicling sources for his understanding of the visions of the end, 18 pages of bibliography, and an 8-page subject index.

I would certainly commend Doukhan for taking on the challenge of addressing the complexities of the book of Daniel. The difficulties of interpreting that document are legion and legendary.

Especially helpful are the insights derived from Doukhan's sensitivity to the literary features and structures of Daniel. These too often have been neglected. A tremendous richness awaits our attention in this arena of investigation. And although apocalyptic literature does not typically yield its ordering principles easily, Doukhan has opened another window or two through which we might profitably catch a glimpse of what makes the book of Daniel tick on the literary level.

Unfortunately, a number of problems attend Doukhan's work. We meet them as we reflect on his purpose and audience, his presuppositions and theoretical underpinnings, his logic in argumentation, and portions of his hermeneutical stance.

Although Doukhan has made it clear that he wants to explore the structure and purpose of Daniel as a vision of the end (the end in our time), his goal blurs a bit because he nowhere identifies his intended audience. On the other hand, much of what he asserts assumes a fairly narrowly-defined interpretational scheme for Daniel which is conservative and denominationally idiosyncratic (e.g., the significance of the year 1844 and the doctrine of the Sabbath) and thus seems to be addressed to readers who share that perspective from the start. There is nothing inappropriate about that; everyone begins with *a priori* assumptions. However, the major sources that support Doukhan's assumptions are conspicuously absent from the bibliography (e.g., Uriah Smith and Ellen G. White). If he is appealing to those who share his assumptions, he will surprise them by failing to include the expected sources; instead, he lists scholarly works deriving from varying viewpoints. If he is attempting to convince those acquainted with the scholarly references, he will likely leave them wondering where he got his assumptions. This approach may frustrate both groups of readers.

Doukhan's presuppositions, which pop up unexpectedly to the uninformed reader, are part and parcel of his methodology and of his conclusions. And it is through this particular set of spectacles that he reads Daniel and interprets its contents. In the process, logical argumentation suffers at times as he stretches some points beyond normal limits and as he appears arbitrary and selective in some of his literary analyses. A close look at the flow of verses on the chart on pp. 4-5, the selected chapters and books on p. 61, and the artificiality of the central paragraph on p. 95 illustrate the latter criticism. Instances of the former include: the assessment of uses of the *Niphal* form of verbs in Dan 8 and 9, noted on pp. 36-37; the discussion of grace and law on p. 42; some of the comments on the kings of the North and South; and remarks about evolution and unity movements on p. 98.

On the question of interpretation, Doukhan moves quite freely among texts and testaments without always taking into account contexts and settings. In addition, ancient and modern, devotional and theological concerns seemingly coalesce. This approach runs the risk of becoming

hermeneutically disoriented. The exegetical controls which govern the investigation of any text need to remain intact for the sake of consistency and integrity.

In conclusion, while Doukhan's work has made some significant contributions to the study of Daniel, its greatest weaknesses lie in the realm of clearly stated presuppositions and a well-defined audience. As a result, *Daniel: Vision of the End* will definitely contribute new insights to those whose reading of the book of Daniel resembles that of Doukhan and to those who share his presuppositions. On the other hand, it might add to the mystery and marvel surrounding Daniel for those who do not.

Walla Walla College
College Place, WA 99324

DOUGLAS R. CLARK

Gundry, Robert H. *Sōma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987 (first published in 1976). 279 pp. Paperback, \$12.95.

Robert Gundry's *Sōma in Biblical Theology* is a sustained attack against the holistic understanding of *sōma*, as set forth primarily by Bultmann in his *Theology of the New Testament*. Gundry notes that Bultmann's holistic definition of *sōma* has been so widely accepted that "virtually all recent handbooks, dictionaries and studies of Pauline theology take it for granted with little or no felt need for argumentative justification" (p. 5).

Gundry's thesis is that a holistic definition of *sōma* cannot be sustained by a careful scrutiny of the biblical material and that a soul and body, inner and outer duality better represents the understanding of the biblical writers. Gundry prefers to speak of duality rather than dualism or dichotomy, since "duality—just because it sounds like a hybrid of 'dual' and 'unity' and poses the possibility of a functional as well as ontological understanding—better expresses Paul's way of thinking" (p. 83). By anthropological duality Gundry does not wish to imply a metaphysical dualism, in which the body is evil, but rather to affirm that man is made up of two substances which belong together though they possess the capability of separation. "Man is body plus soul/spirit, united but divisible" (p. 109). Separability of the corporeal and the incorporeal in man does not suggest any inferiority on the part of the corporeal, because "the true man is the whole man—corporeal and incorporeal together, the incorporeal acting through the corporeal, each equally deficient without the other" (p. 84).

Gundry's unambiguous conclusion is that in this anthropological duality *sōma* always denotes the physical side of man only; it is never used to represent the whole person. For example, Gundry devotes 50 pages to a