softening sectarianism of Adventist leaders and this critical scholarship, a group of "historic Adventists" emerged that sought to restore the denomination's radical sectarian heritage. Meanwhile, that heritage, even in its diluted mainstream form, prevented most Adventists from supporting the "Christian right" in the 1980s. Despite the church's developing pragmatic accommodation with society, Morgan concludes, apocalyptic "was and remains a *central* influence" (210) on Adventism's public involvement.

The author has provided a smoothly written book that clearly explains the nuances of Adventist theology as they relate to the issues of religious liberty and social involvement. Except for Chapter Five, where he uses some correspondence, Morgan depends mostly on published sources, including the *Review and Herald*—the denomination's general paper, *Liberty*—its religious liberty journal, pamphlets, and books by White, Uriah Smith, and others. Curiously, he does not refer to the monthly *Review* columns written by Gary Ross, who served as the church's liaison with Congress from the late 1970s to the early 1990s. But overall, this is a very well researched volume on which readers can depend for accurate scholarship and analysis.

As Martin Marty points out in his foreword, Morgan "treats ... gently" (xiii) the controversies over Ellen G. White's alleged plagiarism, a matter of limited relevance to the volume's subject. But he might have explored more fully such seeming contradictions as the denomination's simultaneous battles for temperance legislation and against Sunday laws, both of which were justified by their supporters as having civil purposes.

Interestingly, the tension between accommodation and radical separatism is again being played out publically. While *Liberty* is currently raising serious questions regarding President George Bush's "faith-based" initiatives, John F. Street, the Democratic, African American, Seventh-day Adventist mayor of Philadelphia has strongly identified with Bush's position. In a few years, Morgan may have a new chapter to write.

Andrews University GARY LAND

Mulder, Martin Jan, and Harry Sysling, eds. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004. xxvi + 929 pp. $49.95.

This reference work consists of twenty chapters on various topics related to the formation and interpretation of the *Mikra*, i.e., "Hebrew Bible" or "Old Testament." The first three chapters deal with its writing, canonization, and transmission. They are followed by a short chapter on the reading customs in early Judaism. The next several chapters cover early translations of the Hebrew Bible. Then there are chapters on biblical interpretation in early Judaism (Qumran, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus, other Hellenistic Jewish authors, and Rabbinic literature). There is a chapter on the use of the Torah in the Samaritan tradition and a chapter on the use of the Bible in Gnostic literature. Finally, there are three chapters on the interpretation of the OT in early Christianity. The individual chapters were written by various authors, including some of the most respected authorities in their field. Since most biblical scholars cannot claim to be experts in all the fields represented in this one volume, the book is a welcome and useful summary of the various related but separate disciplines represented.

Because this reprint is identical to the original edition, except for a page dedicating it to the memory of Martin Mulder, I have little to add to the earlier reviews. The

original work published by Van Gorcum (1998) received over two dozen reviews, including one in this journal (James E. Miller, *AUSS* 28[1990]:175-177). Among the most substantial reviews are those by James H. Charlesworth (*PSB* 12[1991]:107-110); Baruch Halpern (*HS* 31[1990]:218-222); James A. Sanders (*JAOS* 111[1991]:374-376); and Carol A. Newsom (*JSP* 7 [1990]:122-126; reprinted in *JSP* 8 [1991]:111-115).

Given the fact that sixteen years transpired before the reprinting, it might have been useful for the work to have been updated. Certainly, an updated edition would have been a more fitting tribute in honor of Mulder. Nevertheless, many who did not buy the book then will welcome this second opportunity to do so.

Oakwood College TARSEE LI
Huntsville, Alabama

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Interpreting the Bible and the Constitution.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004. xiii + 216 pp. Hardcover, $30.00.

Having formally studied both theology and law, I have been intrigued by the parallels between the interpretation of the Bible and the U.S. Constitution. Both are relatively old documents, written by multiple authors, and infused with broad, and at times apparently conflicting principles; yet both documents are applied to govern specific details of many modern lives. It seems that our experience in interpreting one could shed light on the reading of the other, and vice versa.

However, I had come across no attempt to systematically compare the two worlds of interpretation until Jaroslav Pelikan's recent effort crossed my desk. Pelikan is Sterling Professor of History Emeritus at Yale University and an authority on Christian creeds and tradition. He also displays a broad grasp of the history and practice of constitutional theory and interpretation.

Pelikan's discussion consists of four parts: a comparison of the authoritative role that Scripture and the Constitution play in their respective communities, a comparison of interpretive questions raised by the two documents, a review of the role of original intent in understanding both the literal words and spiritual principles of the documents, and a review of how doctrinal development occurs in the fields of law and theology.

That the Bible and the Constitution play similarly authoritative roles in their communities is not a new thought, but Pelikan proposes that the similarities of the interpretive communities and traditions around each document have been overlooked. Pelikan identifies four interpretive communities for each document: "we the people," academic scholars, professional clergy and lawyers, and the magisterial and ecclesiastical hierarchy. He admits of the importance of all groups, but he views the fourth group, the judges and justices of the courts, and the bishops and councils of the churches, as most authoritative. They can, he asserts, "trump all others" (30). Because of this, he will focus on the interpretive methods and standards of this latter group.

This is the first indication that Pelikan will employ a primarily hierarchical view of biblical interpretive authority, one associated most strongly with the traditional Catholic position, although shared by other traditions that uphold a strong, central interpretive authority. By contrast, there is a strong tradition within Protestanism holding that there is no ultimate earthly interpretive authority for the Bible.

While Protestant churches within this heritage do have doctrinal statements, these differ from Catholic dogmas in that they do not, or at least are not meant to, have equal authority with Scripture. Rather, these statements are subject to Scripture and can be modified and changed in light of further scriptural insight. Thus many Protestant groups