

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.

Andrews University

GEORGE R. KNIGHT

Finegan, Jack. *Myth & Mystery: An Introduction to the Pagan Religions of the Biblical World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989. 335 pp. \$24.95.

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

treated are "pagan." The vast majority of the Gnostic literature extant, for instance, is distinctly Christian, although it was judged "heretical" by the leaders of the early Christian church.

Myth & Mystery is quite ambitious in its coverage. There are chapters treating Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Zoroastrian, Canaanite, Greek, Roman, Gnostic, Mandaeen, and Manichaeen religions. The coverage, however, is not even. The chapter on Zoroastrianism, for example, is at least twice as long as most of the other discussions (only the chapter on Gnosticism comes anywhere close to it, and that chapter is noticeably shorter). The discussions, while informative, are basic, approximating lengthy encyclopedia articles. Thus one is often left with questions.

The book also has other deficiencies. Finegan tells us that each of the Mesopotamian gods is "perceived in terms of" a "visible reality" (p. 22); yet he gives only one example, that of Imdugud portrayed as a great black bird with outstretched wings, whereas he gives a quite detailed list of the animal portrayals of the Egyptian gods (p. 43). In the same way, one could wish for at least a summary listing of the content of the Mesopotamian law codes, especially since Finegan points out that they represent a formal parallel with biblical law.

The bibliography in the back helps offset some of these shortcomings, although its entries are not as up-to-date as one would expect, given the date of publication. The latest edition of *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (1988) is not listed, nor is Bentley Layton's masterful *The Gnostic Scriptures* (1987). *Myth & Mystery* contains a few tables that are useful for summarizing and assimilating the data, but one wishes for more.

There are a number of inconsistencies and errors in the text. On p. 104 Ecbatana is equated with Hamadan (as is correct), but two separate locations are indicated on the map on p. 66. On p. 126 מִצְרַיִם should be מִצְרָיִם. Hermes is referred to as ψυχομοπός and ψυχαγωγός on p. 161; the terms are incorrectly rendered and should read ψυχοπομπός and ψυχαγωγός. On p. 171 νάρθηζ should be νάρθηξ. There are a couple of problems in the spelling of English as well. The new capital city built by Akhenaten is spelled "Akheta-ten" on p. 57, but in the map on p. 41 it is "Akhetaton." The sacred fire dedicated to Verethraghna is spelled "Atash Vahram" on p. 113, while on pp. 114 and 115 it is spelled "Atash Bahram." These errors may be attributed to insufficient editorial oversight or poor typesetting, but the work appears to have been rather hastily put together.

The book is also characterized by the excessive generalization inherent in introductory and general works. In such synthetic descriptions, the differences found in the original sources often disappear; the earliest accounts of these religions can present a bewildering variety that often loses its complexity in abbreviated treatments. The myth of Osiris presents us with a clear example. The relationship among the main characters is not the same in all accounts. In some cases Osiris, Isis, Nephthys, and Seth are all

brothers and sisters, while in other cases Seth and Osiris do not appear to be related. Furthermore, the conflict between Horus and Seth is not always set directly in the context of the Osiris myth. Finegan's treatment fails to represent this complexity, mainly because Finegan's procedure is to describe and summarize the contents of one main presentation.

In a work like this, published by Baker and referring to "the Biblical World" in the subtitle, one expects more than a description of these religions. Finegan does indeed give brief, helpful sections treating their connections to the Bible and biblical history, but only for Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Zoroastrian, and Canaanite religions. These sections, however, are scanty and inconclusive. This is particularly the case when it comes to the discussion of Canaanite religion. This reviewer wanted more than a statement about Israelite derivations of the alphabet and architecture from the Canaanites and the utilization of "many themes of Canaanite mythology" (p. 153); a further explication of what these themes were and how they were used is needed.

Despite these shortcomings, this work is a helpful text for undergraduate students. It provides informative introductions to the various religions discussed and basic bibliographies for further research. On the other hand, advanced students would do well to read the primary sources for themselves, though even for them Finegan provides a good starting place for exploring new fields of study.

South Bend, IN 46625

MATTHEW M. KENT

Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989. liii + 351 pp. \$24.99.

John Goldingay, principal of St. John's College in Nottingham, England, reveals in his introduction the philosophical presupposition underlying this commentary. He believes that God "is capable of inspiring people to write both history and fiction, both actual prophecy and quasi-prophecy, in their own name, anonymously, or—in certain circumstances—pseudonymously" (p. xxxix). In regard to the book of Daniel, he contends that "whether the stories are history or fiction, the visions actual prophecy or quasi-prophecy, written by Daniel or by someone else, in the sixth century B.C., the second, or somewhere in between, makes surprisingly little difference to the book's exegesis" (p. xl). Yet the questions of origin and authorship of the book, which are dealt with in the conclusion (pp. 326-329), are viewed only from the historical-critical standpoint. The stories, Goldingay believes, suggest a setting in the eastern dispersion in the Persian period; the visions, on the other hand, presuppose a setting in Jerusalem around 160 B.C.