
When a first-grader told Art Linkletter that Seventh-day Adventists “hate Catholics,” he was expressing deep-rooted attitudes going back over two centuries. Reinder Bruinsma, communications director for the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) church in Europe, traces the roots of this antagonism to 17th-century Puritans, 18th-century Methodists and Baptists, 19th-century Millerites, and SDAs from 1844 to 1965 (Vatican II).

Puritanism bequeathed a tradition of anti-Catholic apocalyptic prophecy, seeing in “Babylon” and the antichrist references to the papacy. Methodists and Baptists of the “Burned-over District” added millenarianism, seeing in the 1260-year prophecy (538-1798) fulfillment of a “deadly wound” to Rome when the pope was captured in 1798. The Millerites expanded the lexicon of anti-Catholic apocalypticism, equating the “little horn” (Daniel 7) and the “beast” (Revelation 13) with Rome. But they were also unique, predicting the end of Catholicism in 1844 and broadening the definition of “Babylon” to include apostate Protestantism.

Sabbatarian Adventists (1844-63) preached much the same message, but stressed the papacy’s role in changing the Sabbath to Sunday, substituting priestly confession for Christ’s role in the heavenly sanctuary, and its persecution in the past and near future. They paid little attention to current issues in the Catholic-Protestant debate and avoided political involvement with the Know-Nothing Party. In fact, writers attacked Protestantism more than Catholicism for moral and doctrinal corruption.

From 1863 to 1915, SDAs preached these same anti-Catholic apocalyptic views but with less militancy than Baptists and Methodists who joined the American Protestant Association or wrote exposés of convent life. SDAs were more anti-papal than anti-Catholic, seeing in the Sabbath-Sunday issue a “mark of the beast” that would eventually divide God’s people from the damned. In 1901 *Review* editor Uriah Smith expressed “uncompromising opposition to the errors, the workings, and the tendency of [Catholicism], but recognition of every good quality in individual members, and a desire to do them good” (200). Unlike nativists, SDAs saw in Catholic immigration an opportunity to preach the gospel “to all the world” within the United States.

As ecumenism softened Protestant anti-Catholicism after 1915, SDAs, with a strong historicist approach to prophecy, feared that “popery” would be revived. In Al Smith’s 1928 nomination and John Kennedy’s presidency; in FDR’s ambassador to the Vatican; and in the attention given to Vatican II, SDAs saw Rome reviving. As their criticism of apostate Protestantism softened, focus shifted to the end-time threat posed by a rapidly growing Roman Catholic Church.
Unquestionably, this is the definitive work on SDA attitudes toward Catholicism. Bruinsma’s 72-page bibliography and 300 heavily footnoted pages demonstrate his scholarly thoroughness. He uses sources critically, sifting the biased or hagiographic from the objective and scholarly. Bruinsma raises questions about the paradox of how Rome can be declining from its “deadly wound” yet be dangerous (52); the irony of SDAs rejecting the Trinity as “popish error” but later accepting it as biblical (110); and their refusal either to dialogue with Catholic leaders or to become politically active against Catholicism (116). New light is shed on Ellen White, who was more concerned about saving Catholic souls than with attacking the hierarchy.

Regrettably, this outstanding book has its flaws. Its small, typewritten print; its use of Britishisms (spelling, midsentence parenthetical phrases, excessive exclamations, and—worst of all—“Burnt-over District”); and its odd style of paragraphing mar the reader’s enjoyment. Poor proofreading has admitted dozens of mistakes—one-word “orphans,” misspellings, poor punctuation. American readers know that the French and Indian War began in 1754 (not 1756); that the Fox sisters lived in Hydesville (not Rochester); and that Xenia is in Ohio.

Nonetheless, both church historians and laity will benefit from a close reading of this book. Someone should now study SDA attitudes toward Catholicism from 1965 to the present.
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The author, Tutor in New Testament Theology at Spurgeon’s College in London, traced “the elders” from the Old Testament through the life and institutions of Second Temple Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world of the first century before tackling the subject in the New Testament writings. He admits that for Ancient Israel “our sources say very little about the elders” (20), and “the period between the reforms of Nehemiah and the Maccabean uprising is a notoriously shadowy one so far as hard evidence goes” (28). Campbell says that the question, Who ran the ancient synagogues? is “a hard question to answer,” “partly due to the fragmentary nature of our evidence” (45); therefore the author and the reader have to be cautious about their conclusions.

From the reading of Jewish sources the author concludes that the “elders are senior men of the community, heads of the leading families within it, who as such exercise an authority that is informal, representative and collective . . . ‘The elders’ does not so much denote an office as