It is not possible in a short review to deal with matters of exegesis in detail, but we will select a few points for discussion. Fung opts for the position that Paul went to Arabia after his conversion, not for "solitary communion with God and reflection" (p. 68) but to preach to King Aretas's subjects in Arabia, which brought the hostility of the king against him and thus later necessitated his flight from Damascus. The commentary follows Bruce in rejecting Gamaliel's connection with the School of Hillel. Thus Paul belonged to a radical wing of the Pharisees, perhaps the school of Shammai (p. 72). The author believes that this fits well with Paul's attitude toward the Gentiles.

Fung's exegesis of Galatians 3 is excellent. Nevertheless, his comments on that chapter and his statement that "freedom from the law means for the Christian first and foremost freedom from the law as a means of justification (and secondarily as a principle of life)" (p. 217) need further clarification. This he furnishes later, but without explicitly connecting it to his earlier remark. His explanation of Paul's apparent paradox of proclaiming freedom from the law and yet exhorting fulfillment of the law through love is more logical and balanced. "In other words," Fung writes, "the believer who is free from the law is at the same time one who fulfills the law; only the way he fulfills the law is not by punctiliously observing the rules and regulations of an external code, but by the new way of love, which is generated within the believer by the power of the Holy Spirit . . ." (p. 247).

While it will not be considered the single best commentary on Galatians, the present work is a good addition to treatments of this epistle.
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With the appearance of these two volumes, Finney studies are experiencing a long-awaited renaissance. Although the foremost American evangelist of the antebellum nineteenth century and a major stimulator of
social reform, Finney has been largely neglected by a scholarly world that often quotes him and nearly always mentions him when dealing with nineteenth-century religious and cultural history. Prior to Keith Hardman's work, the only substantial biography had been published in 1891. Likewise, the only published edition of Finney's memoirs came off the press in 1876 (shortly after Finney's death), and has up until recently never been updated—even though the first edition was seriously flawed and did not always faithfully represent the original manuscript.

Hardman's biography traces Finney's life from his conversion, through his successful evangelism in the frontier areas of New York's "burnt-over district," and into the years when he established himself in the great cities of Philadelphia, Boston, and New York. The author then goes on to treat the evangelist's work during the Oberlin years, when Finney served as professor of theology and later president of that important reform institution.

In the process of detailing Finney's life, Hardman covers his subject's involvement in social reform, his theological and ecclesiastical controversies, and his theology. While largely accomplishing its goals in these areas, the book could have devoted more time to the development of Finney's theology in the context of the transformation then taking place in American Calvinism. Such treatment on that topic that does exist is somewhat flawed by the author's own theological biases, which show through in his labeling of certain positions as heretical, or "Arminian" in what seems to be a pejorative sense. On the other hand, such allusions may not reflect bias as much as the fact that the author may be more sophisticated as a historian than as a theologian.

The purpose of this biography is "to establish Finney's proper place in history" as "a catalyst and often a prime mover in achieving the enormous shift that occurred in Protestant church practices and theology" during the antebellum period (pp. ix-x). By and large, the book achieves its purpose. It does so by placing Finney and his "new measures" in the stream of mass evangelism, rather than by seeing him as its father. On the other hand, even though Hardman's work does evidence some interpretation of the meaning of Finney in the nineteenth century, the book is largely descriptive. That accomplishment, however, is no mean feat, given the vast amount of material on Finney.

Hardman's biography demonstrates that he has mastered the sources. He makes good use of Finney's own published and unpublished writings, contextual documents, and the works of the evangelist's detractors. Having read with a critical eye, the author repeatedly demonstrates that Finney's Memoirs are often inaccurate and, at times, self-serving.

That topic brings us to the recent publication of Finney's Memoirs. The first edition, edited by James H. Fairchild in 1876, contains a note in the preface indicating that Fairchild had published the material essentially as he had found it. To put it mildly, that statement is misleading. I first
discovered its falsity in the early 1980s during a visit to the Oberlin College Archives, where I examined the handwritten originals for more information on Finney’s visit with William Miller in Boston in 1842. A quick comparison of the Fairchild edition and the original manuscript indicated fairly large discrepancies on many topics. That problem had earlier come to the attention of Garth Rosell in 1976. Further investigation by the editors of the Complete Restored Text indicated that approximately 20 percent of the material in the original had been either modified or deleted entirely. They later discovered that Fairchild, somewhat in harmony with the feelings of Finney, made many of the changes to avoid unnecessary offense at a time when many of the evangelist’s contemporaries were still living. Other changes were felt to be necessary because of Finney’s aggressive style, while still other sections may have been deleted to reduce the size of the manuscript. Unfortunately, Fairchild’s preface to the first edition obscured that important information.

Rosell and Dupuis’ research also makes it clear that Finney never intended to write an autobiography, but, in the belief “that the evangelization of the world depended on a resurgence of the kind of revivals of religion that had prevailed in America forty years earlier” (p. xix), to defend his methods and the revivals themselves. Such a purpose helps us account for what seems to be the skew of some of the evangelist’s recollections and, at times, their apparently self-serving purpose.

The Complete Restored Text is prefaced by an extensive research essay that introduces the reader to Finney and the purpose of his memoirs, the history of the manuscript, the history of the development and publication of the memoirs, a description of the original manuscript, and Rosell and Dupuis’ editorial policy.

Then follow the memoirs themselves. Those parts that were altered by Fairchild in any way or that differ from the first published edition are printed in bold type. For the convenience of researchers, the page breaks for both the first edition and the manuscript are indicated in the text, while the page numbers for those two documents are found in the margin. Discussions of significant handwritten notes found in the various handwritings on the original manuscript and significant differences between the original and Fairchild are found in extensive and very helpful footnotes. Much supplementary material is also provided by the notes. All in all, the restored manuscript—the work of over a decade—is a model for this type of reconstruction.

The reconstructed memoirs are followed by an appendix containing a rare Finney document referred to in the manuscript, an extensive bibliography of Finney sources, and a 35-page index that provides access to most topics in the Memoirs.

Hardman, Rosell, and Dupuis have rendered a major service to scholars of American cultural and religious history. While their combined work
may not be the final word on Finney, it most certainly in the future will be
the starting point for the serious study of one of nineteenth-century
America's most important figures.
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Kang, Sa-Moon. *Divine War in the Old Testament and in the Ancient
die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 177. 251 pp. $71.75.

This study is an investigation of the motif of divine war in the ancient
Near Eastern historical sources and of YHWH war in the historical battles
of the Bible. This Korean scholar observes some specific parallels of the
divine-war motif in the ancient Near East and in the preexilic era of the
Bible.

Analyzing the war motifs in the rising period of the nations of Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Syro-Palestine, and Egypt, Kang notices that divine
war in the historical Syro-Palestine sources is not found before the period
of the Davidic kingdom. In Ugarit, a vassal state of the Hittite kingdom,
divine war was a mythological battle, such as in the Baal myth.

In the ancient Near Eastern context, war was recognized as originating
in a divine command. The duty of the king was to carry out the war as a
divine mission. The Hittite and Mesopotamian kings appealed to God as
their Judge, as well as their Warrior, who was fighting against the enemy.
The war started with a religious consultation to seek the divine will
through omens, oracles, or priests. The war began after the discernment of
the divine favor. The divine warriors themselves participated on the battle-
field to destroy the enemies. The visible symbols of divine participation in
battle were the divine standards or statues. The idea of total destruction is
found only in the Anatolian context. The victory was ultimately a divine
victory. The ancient Near Eastern kings used to erect steles or monuments
or build temples to commemorate the victory of the divine warriors.

The ideology of the divine war was perpetuated in the cultic event in
which the battle drama was reactualized. Thus, the actual wars and the
cultic event formed two poles in the formation of divine war.

Part Two examines the motifs of Yahweh war in the historical battles
of the OT, particularly Israel's victory in Exodus 14-15 under Moses and
the major wars during the Davidic kingdom. The biblical war motifs in
the exilic and postexilic periods reveal, however, solely an eschatological
and apocalyptic dimension.

Kang concludes that the divine war as an historical reality of battle
can be seen for the first time in the battles of David. In the Reed Sea event
of Exodus 14-15 the human soldiers played no role. The epic character of