While it should not replace such classic works as those by Cranfield and Barrett, Dunn’s commentary is an excellent up-to-date resource that is both thorough and, for the most part, readable. Volume one covers Rom 1-8, and volume two treats chaps. 9-16. The preface, abbreviations, and general bibliography of volume one are repeated nearly verbatim in the second volume.
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*Towards Righteousness by Faith* is composed of five papers presented at the South Pacific Division of Seventh-day Adventists’ commemoration of the centennial of the historic 1888 Minneapolis General Conference session. The meeting took place at Dunmore Lang College, Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia, on September 25-26, 1988.

The year 1888 stands large in the development of Adventist theology. Up to that time the church had emphasized its distinctively Adventist doctrines (e.g., seventh-day Sabbath, heavenly ministry of Christ, his premillennial advent, and so on) to the detriment of those truths it held in common with other Christians. The 1888 General Conference session saw a challenge to that historical trend as two young editors from California (A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner) uplifted Christ and his saving righteousness. Their “new” teaching was seen by denominational leaders G. I. Butler and Uriah Smith to be a threat to the sacred place of the law and obedience in Adventist theology. Thus the conference was one of dissension.

Because of the importance of the Minneapolis General Conference session, a large literature has developed around it. In fact, that meeting probably has had more written about it than any other event in Seventh-day Adventist history. Unfortunately, the literature is just as ideologically divided as were the participants in the 1888 meetings themselves (see my *Angry Saints: Tensions and Possibilities in the Adventist Struggle over Righteousness by Faith* [Washington, DC, 1989]). One of the latest contributions to this growing body of literature is Arthur Ferch’s volume. The editor’s preface captures the central significance of the meetings when he writes that “one of the elements which has made the Minneapolis meetings memorable was the exaltation of Jesus” in a religious body in which many had “lost sight” of him (p. 3).

The volume’s first paper is by Arthur N. Patrick, who hypothesizes that the 1888 crisis was in essence a struggle between the stabilizing influences of the older leaders, with their desire for continuity, and the “second-generation
'progressives,' with their felt need for innovation (p. 15). Thus at least part of the meaning of the event for Patrick is that the meetings provide an excellent case for those interested in the study of sociological and intellectual change in a religious body and the dynamics of authority in that process. That provocative theme is certainly one that could be developed into a monograph or a Ph.D. dissertation.

One of the most valuable contributions of *Towards Righteousness by Faith* is that by Norman H. Young. Young examines Adventist exegesis of Gal 3:19-25 (the biblical storm center of the conflict) in both the 1888 meetings and historically up through the modern period. The interpretive struggle at Minneapolis focused on the "historical" (Smith and Butler's position) versus the "individual" (Waggoner and Jones' position) understanding of the law in Galatians. Young found that subsequent to the Minneapolis meetings the Waggoner/Jones position became the dominant one for several decades. On the other hand, Young concluded that while most modern Adventist exegetes do not agree fully with either polar interpretation, most lean toward many of the positions taken by Butler and Smith.

Two of the papers treated the theology and contributions of the protagonists at Minneapolis. Milton R. Hook examined "The Message of E. J. Waggoner," while Kerry H. Hortop explored the contribution of A. T. Jones. Hook used a method in reconstructing Waggoner's 1888 teachings similar to that being independently utilized at the same time in the United States by Clinton L. Wahlen in a Master of Divinity thesis at Andrews University entitled "Selected Aspects of Ellet J. Waggoner's Eschatology and Their Relation to His Understanding of Righteousness by Faith" (1988). While Hook and Wahlen had almost diametrically opposed purposes and presuppositions, both utilized the same methodology and covered some of the same ground. Of the two treatments, however, Wahlen's casts a broader net and goes into much greater depth. Unfortunately, apparently neither scholar knew that the other was working on the project.

The major problem in *Towards Righteousness by Faith* is that the papers by Hook and Hortop are seriously flawed by uncritically building on the faulty thesis undergirding such treatments of the Minneapolis issues as those of Geoffrey J. Paxton (*The Shaking of Adventism* [Grand Rapids, MI, 1977]) and David P. McMahon (*Ellet Joseph Waggoner: The Myth and the Man* [Fallbrook, CA, 1979]). All four of these Australian authors overplayed the importance of justification by faith while underplaying the role of sanctification. Coupled with a misunderstanding of both the classical Reformation (e.g., confounding the views of Luther with those of certain of his followers) and the Council of Trent (which included sanctification within its definition of justification), they imply the nonbiblical view that justification and sanctification can be separated in the experience of an individual and thus in one's definition of righteousness by faith. While they
can be separated for purposes of theological definition, the NT does not teach experiential separation—one is either “in Christ” or out of Christ; the person who is justified is also being sanctified.

Beyond that problem, Hook and Hortop follow the lead of Paxton, McMahon, Desmond Ford, and the later Robert Brinsmead (all strong influences in Australian Adventism) in overemphasizing the importance of justification to the detriment of other NT concepts. Justification, after all, is merely one of many NT word pictures of salvation. In addition, contrary to the generally-accepted Adventist restorationist interpretation, these authors apparently see the Reformation as a static event that took place in the sixteenth century, rather than as a progressive historical process. Beyond those difficulties, both Hook and Hortop, as might be expected (given their presuppositions), tend to view Wesleyanism, with its emphasis on obedience and sanctification, in a pejorative sense. Such a treatment implies a serious lack of knowledge of the Wesleyan roots of Adventist theology—a problem that affects several strands of contemporary Adventist theological thought, especially the theology of those Adventist writers who dichotomize justification and sanctification and of those at the other end of the Adventist soteriological spectrum who seek to understand Ellen White’s Wesleyan usage of the word “perfection” in Calvinistic terms.

Ferch’s volume closes with a very helpful treatment by Robert W. Olson of Ellen G. White’s teachings on righteousness by faith before, during, and after the 1888 meetings. Olson demonstrates that Ellen White’s position did not change significantly across that time frame. His essay also serves as a corrective to those by Hook and Hortop. Olson’s findings indicate that “Ellen White included both justification and sanctification under the rubric of righteousness by faith” (p. 103). Thus she reflected both the biblical perspective and her Wesleyan upbringing. True also to her Methodist roots was her treatment, as set forth by Olsen, of “perfection” and the life of victory.

Overall, Towards Righteousness by Faith is a helpful addition to the ongoing soteriological discussion within Adventism. That is particularly true of the essays by Young, Olson, and (to a lesser extent) Patrick.
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Jack Finegan is well known for his works on archaeology and its relation to the Bible. Now he has produced an encyclopedic work treating various religions of the biblical world and their relationship to the Bible. The subtitle is something of a generalization, as not all of the religions