

outline of the book, purpose and message, structure and organization, and major themes.

Early in the preface, the authors state their presupposition: "God has revealed himself in Scripture, and inspiration guarantees the authority and integrity of that revelation." Even though the book is evangelical in perspective, it presents the various positions held on problems encountered by Bible students. In addition, the annotated bibliography includes titles from various positions of biblical scholarship.

A commendable feature of the book is its readability. The use of a two-column page enhances this. In addition, the authors use simple and clear language. Maps and figures are included. The time lines provided are helpful. Questions for further study at the end of each survey are useful for classroom or small group discussion.

Notwithstanding its good points, the book has some weak spots. The article on archaeology in the prologue is brief. It does not discuss the archaeological periods which are mentioned in passing in the article on the historical overview of the OT (28-32). Yet, in some sections of the book, archaeological periods are used (165, 174).

Inasmuch as the book is a general survey of the Old Testament, it may be of limited value to the advanced student of the Bible. It is however, highly recommended for pastors, lay members, and undergraduate students. Anyone who uses this survey, I believe, will be encouraged to study more deeply into the Old Testament.

Adventist International Institute of  
Advanced Studies  
Silang, Cavite, Philippines

FELIPE TAN

Linnemann, Eta. *Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology?*  
Translated by Robert W. Yarbrough. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book  
House, 1990. 169 pp. \$9.95.

The author of this skillfully translated book has been best known to the English-speaking world through her *Jesus of the Parables*, a work applying principles learned from her mentors, Rudolf Bultmann and Ernst Fuchs, as well as other major lights of German scholarship. Her career was following a standard track in the German academic world when she experienced a religious conversion. In 1978 she totally repudiated her past life and work. Her book is a confession of faith, a passionate war cry, a call for repentance, a manifesto and a program. She explicitly regards her former orientation as not merely mistaken, but Satanic.

The book is divided into two parts. Part 1, "Christianity and the Modern University," is a broad attack on the modern intellectual scene.

Like Tertullian, she wants Jerusalem to have nothing to do with Athens: "The university as a phenomenon of Western culture was from the very beginning a pagan institution" (23). She deplores the story of successive Scholasticism, Humanism, Enlightenment, German Idealism, and modern technology as a steady march away from faith and God's revealed truth. Scientific thought is atheistic and even modern medical science is a mixed blessing at best, if not a positive evil (34). Truth and good are to be found only in God's Book, not "the many mutually contradictory books that claim validity for themselves on the basis of being 'scientific'" (35; it should be said that Dr. Linnemann, since writing this book, has moderated her view enough to acknowledge some positive uses of science).

Linnemann's arrows, shot by one who dwelt first in Athens and then in Jerusalem, are sometimes well aimed. She explodes the myth of academic neutrality and objectivity; she scathes the selectivity of scholarly tolerance and the maintenance of intellectual monopolies; and she convincingly describes the way young aspiring academicians are subtly pressed into a mold, made after their mentors' images. Beyond that, having warned against being unequally yoked with unbelievers, she sketches in some detail a program for a Christian alternative to the secular university, integrating faith and Bible-based learning. In this, philosophy will have no place: "A search for truth beyond God's word is sin" (54). Also to be avoided is the hubris of exploration without boundaries: she deplores "the tendency to regard everything that can be explored as something that should be explored" and "the compulsive preoccupation with 'progress'" (66).

At this point one begins to wonder if the cure might turn out to be worse than the disease, but Linnemann has not yet got down to her special villain. That is taken up in Part 2, "God's Word and Historical-Critical Theology."

The term is important. She is here attacking an ideology, not a method (though there are hints that she might not approve the classical historical-critical methods either). She charges that the basic principle of this ideology is to conduct research as if there were no God. The Bible is relativized in various ways and its inspiration, as well as its unity, is denied. She opposes "a canon within the canon." Linnemann believes that dependence on the Holy Spirit obviates the need for scholarly interpretation, which is inconclusive anyway (87). The basic fallacy of the ideology which she calls Historical-Critical Theology is naturalism, which has no place for divine intervention on earth.

Some of Linnemann's barbs penetrate sensitive and vulnerable heels: "In theory all relevant historical-critical publications on a given theme would be taken into account. In practice this turns out to be impossible due to the constantly growing flood of publication" (89). Perhaps with excessive harshness she contends that "the claim that truth is discovered

on the basis of critical argumentation is another self-deception" because one will be impressed only by the set of arguments which support conclusions held on ideological grounds or on the basis of the conventional wisdom of the time. Prevailing traditions had their genesis in nothing more than "sinful intuitions" (132). The dominant hypotheses cannot be verified and are accepted only because of their plausibility in the prevailing intellectual climate. "Overwhelmed by the 'expertise' of theologians, the student or the person being confirmed or the church member loses all confidence of being able to personally understand God's word" (95). Linnemann dislikes the incarnational model of Scripture which sees it as both Word of God and word of man (101), apparently believing in some sort of *communicatio idiomatum*, by which everything in or about the Bible is divine and not human. She denounces Baconian inductive study, claiming that "the so-called knowledge was in truth only a decision" (115).

Once again, Linnemann is not content to bombard what she opposes; she outlines an alternative. Thinking, she affirms, must of necessity be regimented in order to communicate. But reason must be subordinated to Bible, not the reverse. Presuppositions such as uniformitarianism and naturalism, which undergird critical thinking must be discarded. "In the theology of faith, the necessary regulation of thought must occur through the Holy Scripture. . . . Thought must subordinate itself to the Word of God. If difficulties crop up, it does not doubt God's Word but its own wisdom" (111). Though she insists that "Questions are solved on one's knees, not through ransacking commentaries," she does not despise all scholarly accomplishments. She affirms the need to learn the original languages and biblical backgrounds and to study typology.

What can be said about such a book? It must be pointed out that many of the stones thrown can easily be tossed back at the thrower. Persons of a Fundamentalist orientation exhibit no more agreement about the teaching of Scripture than the scholars whom she attacks. No less than "rationalists," fideists may bring to their Bible study presuppositions drawn from elsewhere. If learning does not insure infallibility, neither does lack of it. Who would affirm that the so-called Age of Faith produced a purer form of Christianity than the Enlightenment? Linnemann appears to replace one kind of intellectual arrogance with another.

In fairness it must be recognized that Linnemann speaks from her experience in the academic theology of the European Continent. She is either unaware of, or rejects on a priori grounds, the positive uses of historical-critical *methods* (as distinguished from *ideology*) by believing evangelical scholars in the English-speaking world (such as F. F. Bruce, T. W. Manson, G. E. Ladd, R. H. Stein, to name only a few). A popular canard runs: "New theological movements are created in Germany, corrected in Britain, and corrupted in America." If that was true of the

abuses of the historical-critical method, we can only pray that a worthy Briton will arise to salvage this would-be antithesis.

Andrews University

ROBERT M. JOHNSTON

Pearson, Michael. *Millennial Dreams and Moral Dilemmas: Seventh-day Adventists and Contemporary Ethics*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1990. x + 328 pp. \$54.40.

Michael Pearson's *Millennial Dreams and Moral Dilemmas* is the published version of his D.Phil. dissertation completed under the direction of Bryan Wilson of All Souls College, Oxford. The book's primary purpose "is to break new ground in the chronicling and analysis of significant developments in Seventh-day Adventist moral thought" (8). A secondary objective is to explore the actual practices of Adventists in the areas selected for study.

Some readers might feel that the book's title is misleading, since the "moral dilemmas" and "contemporary ethics" treated all fall in the sexual realm. The major portion of the book covers Adventist marital relations, Adventists and abortion, sex roles in the denomination, and the attitudes and practices of the denomination in regard to divorce and homosexuality. Two chapters are devoted to each of these topics.

Delimiting his coverage to American Adventism, Pearson provides general historical context on each topic, including the positions of other churches. He then develops a "detailed chronology" of Adventism's responses to each of the selected issues approximately through 1985. These responses include both official and unofficial statements. The treatment of each topic closes with an attempt to evaluate the relationship of the dilemma to actual Adventist practice.

The accomplishment of that last task, however, leaves much to be desired because of the dearth of statistical data in the field. That difficulty, of course, is no fault of Pearson, but rather indicates the work yet to be done in a field in which it is difficult to collect accurate data—especially from people who can be expected to be quite conservative in sexual matters and who might have a difficult time coming to grips with less-than-satisfactory behavior in areas traditionally associated with a great deal of guilt.

It should be noted that Pearson did not attempt to add to data on Adventist sexual attitudes and practices. Rather, he surveyed the existing knowledge.