EDITORIAL: NEW STAFF, NEW DESIGN, NEW WEBSITE, AND NEW GUIDELINES

Every now and then, in the ongoing process of building and maintaining work teams, a point of synergy is achieved where the whole equals more than a sum of the parts. Such it is with our current staff at *Andrews University Seminary Studies* (*AUSS*). We have had a number of excellent student and staff workers over the years that have kept the journal on course and publishing well. The current team contains three excellent student workers. It is the combination of these three, Rebecca Murdock, Dominic Bornand, and Matthew L. Tinkham Jr., along with the two editors, Martin F. Hanna and John W. Reeve, and the three copyeditors, Bonnie Beres, Madeline Johnston, and Jennifer Payne, that gives this team its combined effect.

No doubt you noticed the new cover design by Pastor Javier Maldonado starting with the Spring 2016 issue. Completing the transition to this new cover was the first of many achievements that have been made possible by this new team. The new branding, as indicated on the new cover, emphasizes the abbreviation *AUSS*, which has long been the scholarly moniker for the journal, especially as used in footnotes and bibliographies.

This summer we launched a newly designed website (www.andrews.edu/auss), a new interactive communication system between the editors and writers and referees (via the website), and new guidelines for writers of articles and book reviews and began work on subscriber digital access (which will even include preprinted access to the latest journal also via the website). These major steps forward were completed with speed and alacrity, but they are not the end. Though most subscribers will never see it, the whole office has been transformed, including a change from a mostly paper-based tracking system to an electronic records system. Even the stacks of back issues have been reorganized, reboxed, and reshelved. The day set for the office organizing party lasted from midmorning until early the next morning with the whole team (and my daughter, Madeleine Reeve) working nearly twenty-four hours straight, and with only a few small screwdriver injuries during shelf reconstruction.

The new website has greatly improved editorial interactions with authors and referees, making them more convenient going forward because of the semi-automated system on the new website. The one drawback is that each referee or author has to set up an individual online account. All article and book review submissions can now be uploaded at www.andrews.edu/auss. Referees receive invitations and instructions from the system for refereeing articles and can upload their referee reports directly to the new website via the unique URL that they receive. Authors can download those reports when they are made available and upload their revised drafts through the system as well as check on the status of those drafts. Once the final versions of articles are published to the online archives, the authors will receive a unique URL for their articles that can be used for sharing or posting to their professional

websites. Thus, this new website functions as an effective communication hub between authors, editors, and referees and should prevent anything from "slipping through the cracks."

It has been a number of years since the *AUSS* guidelines for authors and book reviewers have had a thorough revision. They have now been revised, largely in accordance with *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd edition, *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th edition, and Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers*, 8th edition, while retaining a few long-term style decisions particular to *AUSS*. Part of the reason for the new guidelines is that the Society of Biblical Literature released the second edition of *The SBL Handbook of Style* in 2014, and it promises to be a leader for style in the world of biblical studies and biblical theology. One of the corrections from the first edition is to place the publishing information within the parentheses in footnotes and endnotes, which puts them in line with Turabian and *The Chicago Manual of Style*. This second edition not only improves the great lists of abbreviations for use by scholars, but it also greatly improves the examples of references for the areas of biblical and theological studies. Thus, the *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd edition, becomes the primary source for style in *AUSS*. The new guidelines for authors of articles and book reviews can be found on the next few pages of this issue. They can also be found on the new website at www.andrews.edu/auss.

The *AUSS* community of scholars, editors, and supporters has been in conversation with the larger academy for fifty-five years and remains committed to objectivity in research and writing within the context of biblical faith. We want to thank the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University for providing the bulk of the financial support for *AUSS*, which allows the journal to be truly academic. We also depend on our readers to complete the community conversation and on our subscribers to complete the financial support needed to continue the high quality of scholarly publication. For this we, the *AUSS* editorial team, want to thank you. We invite you to comment, subscribe, or renew at any time at www.andrews.edu/auss.

JWR

Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 54, No. 2, 195–199.

ARTICLE GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

Thank you for considering *Andrews University Seminary Studies* (*AUSS*) as a potential publishing outlet for your article. Before submitting it, please take a few moments to review the following submission guidelines. Articles that do not conform to these guidelines will be returned to the author for corrections. *AUSS* strives for the highest quality in publishing content. Therefore, an article must represent an original and previously unpublished study, must not have been submitted to other journals concurrently with the submission to *AUSS*, and must be in what the author intends as its final form.

Topics Accepted for Publishing

AUSS publishes research articles and brief notes on the following topics: biblical archaeology and history of antiquity; Hebrew Bible and New Testament studies; church history of all periods; historical, biblical, systematic, and philosophical theology; science and religion; ethics; world religions; and missiology. Occasionally, selected research articles on ministry and Christian education may also be published (it is recommended that authors query the editors before submitting on these topics).

Focus of Published Works

AUSS accepts articles written by authors of different faith persuasions. However, the focus of the journal, as that of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, where *AUSS* is based, is biblical. A high regard for Scripture, along with elevated standards of research, characterizes the choice of articles.

Language Requirements

AUSS accepts articles written in the scholarly languages of English, French, and German. Articles submitted to *AUSS* in English must conform to acceptable English language standards. American spelling and punctuation will be used in editing. Authors are asked to use gender-inclusive language, such as "humanity" rather than "mankind" and "person" or "human being" rather than "man."

Preferred Length

AUSS prefers articles with 5,000–10,000 words, including footnotes. Longer articles may occasionally be accepted, if they are particularly significant and space is available in the journal (it is recommended that authors query the editors concerning such articles). When the editors deem that an article needs

to be substantially shortened, they will return the manuscript to the author with instructions regarding the areas needing attention.

Style Manual

For style matters and scholarly abbreviations, *AUSS* uses Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). For cases of ambiguity or those not covered in *SBL Handbook of Style*, follow University of Chicago, *The Chicago Manual of Style: The Essential Guide for Writers, Editors, and Publishers*, 16th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010) and Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*, 8th ed., rev. Wayne C. Booth et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013). For spelling, authors may refer to Philip Babcock Gove, ed., *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 2002).

Style and Formatting

Manuscripts for articles should be double-spaced (except footnotes and indented quotations), have one-inch margins, and be left-justified. Excessive formatting should be avoided, with only block quotations, tables, figures, headings, and subheadings included. Tabs should be used rather than single spacing or first-line indentation. Sentences should have only a single space between them. Tables should be formed using standardized table templates provided in the author's word-processing software. The motto for formatting is, "Keep it simple!" Please note the formatting techniques that follow.

Quotations

Quotations longer than five lines are to be indented and single-spaced. Spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and abbreviations must be reproduced exactly as in the original and care should be taken to preserve the original author's intent. When making omissions in quotations, the use of ellipses should follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.1.3. However, the format of the ellipses themselves should *not* follow the handbook but instead include one space before and after each period (e.g., . . . , rather than ...). A space should also be placed between ellipses and original punctuation. Ellipses normally should not be used at the beginning or end of a quotation.

Citations and Abbreviations

Citations and abbreviations for all biblical, classical, and patristic literature, Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts, Targumic material, Mishnaic and Rabbinic literature, Nag Hammadi Tractates, and journals, periodicals, and major reference works should follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 8.2–8.4.

For biblical references, no period is used following the abbreviations; a colon is used between chapter and verse. Biblical references should be placed in parentheses in the text of the article, rather than in footnotes (see *SBL*

Handbook of Style, 2nd ed., 4.1.8.3, 8.2–8.3.1). Citations of classical and patristic literature should follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed.

The following abbreviations should be used in parenthetical or footnote references. The terms should be spelled out when they occur in the text.

ch(s).	chapter(s)	n(n).	note(s)
col(s).	column(s)	pl(s).	plate(s)
frag(s).	fragment(s)	v(v).	verse(s)

Footnotes

For footnote formatting techniques, see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 7.1–7.4. Ordinal numbers used for sources with more than one edition, reprints, etc. should not have superscripted letters (e.g., 2nd ed., rather than 2nd ed.; see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 8.4). Page numbers included in footnotes should be all-inclusive (e.g., 110–111; 234–239, rather than 110–11; 234–39) and should not include the abbreviation p(p). before them.

When a note of comment includes a bibliographical reference, this reference should be set in parentheses at the end of the comment. When parentheses are needed within parentheses, brackets should be used. For instance: "But C. C. Torrey thinks that the name Cyrus has been interpolated in Isa 45:1" ("The Messiah Son of Ephraim," *JBL* 66 [1947]: 253).

Biblical Languages

Greek and Hebrew fonts are generally preferred rather than transliteration. Transliteration should be used primarily for ancient nonbiblical languages. Due to the problem of font compatibility, *AUSS* accepts only unicode fonts. Before submitting Greek and Hebrew in other fonts or transliterations, please query the editors for directions.

Dates

The format of dates in footnotes should follow the day-month-year system with the name of the month spelled out (e.g., 23 September 2016; see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.3.7.1). Inclusive dates should use all digits for all years (e.g., 1857–1868, rather than 1857–68; see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.2.5). Abbreviations for chronological eras should follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 8.1.2 (e.g., 457 BC or AD 325).

Hyphens and Dashes

SBL Handbook of Style, 2nd ed., 2.1.3.4, should be followed when using hyphens and dashes. Hyphens (-) are generally used to form certain compound terms, especially compound adjectives. En dashes (–) should be used when representing a span or range of numbers (i.e., page numbers [e.g., 36–42] or textual references [e.g., John 1:1–3]) and dates (e.g., 1963–2016) and also can be used between words to represent conflict, connection, or direction

(e.g., "liberal–conservative debate"). Em dashes (—) can be used for phrases or clauses that interupt the flow of a sentence and are normally set apart by commas, parentheses, or colons. Spaces should not be placed between the hyphen or dash and the words or numbers that they connect.

Numbers

When used in nontechnical contexts, whole numbers zero through one hundred and ordinal numbers that are used in stentences should be spelled out and follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.2.1–4.2.2. Arabic numbers (1, 10) are preferred over roman numerals (I, X). For exceptions, see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.2.2.

Abstract

After the title, the article should include an abstract of 150–200 words that succinctly summarizes the content of the article by identifying the research issue(s) being addressed, the methodology employed, the research results and findings, and the main conclusions and recommendations. The thesis of the article should be clearly stated in the abstract. At the end of the abstract three to five keywords should be listed for search purposes.

Submission

Articles may be submitted by uploading them onto the submission webpage on the *AUSS* website (www.andrews.edu/auss). The "Submit Manuscript" link in the sidebar directs to the submission webpage. Please note that you will be prompted to create an online account (e-mail address and password) with *AUSS*, if you do not have one already. *AUSS* will accept articles prepared in Microsoft Word. Tables, charts, or diagrams should be reproducible in Microsoft Word. Photographs should be black and white with strong contrast and high resolution. They can be submitted by uploading them in JPEG format onto the submission webpage on the *AUSS* website (www.andrews.edu/auss) after the article has been submitted.

Referee Process

AUSS is a refereed journal. After submission, each article is read by at least two, and often three, scholars who are competent in the area(s) treated in the article. To maintain objectivity, the name(s) of the author(s) should not appear on the submitted manuscript, and the instructions in the "Ensuring a Blind Referee Process" section below should be followed carefully because this will be the manuscript that is sent to the referees. *AUSS* editors will refer helpful referee comments to the author to facilitate the process of any necessary rewriting. After revising the manuscript, the author may resubmit the article. Revised manuscripts should be accompanied by a cover letter detailing the changes requested and the action taken (or the author's argument for retaining the original text). A final decision on whether or not the article will be published in *AUSS* is made by the editors.

Ensuring a Blind Referee Process

To ensure the integrity of the blind referee process for submission to this journal, every effort should be made to prevent the identities of the authors and referees from being known to each other. This involves the authors, editors, and referees (who upload documents as part of their refereeing) checking to see if the following steps have been taken with regard to the text and the file properties

- The authors of the document should delete their names from the text, with "Author" and year used in the references and footnotes, instead of the authors' names, article title, etc.
- With Microsoft Word documents, author identification also should be removed from the properties of the file (see the Microsoft Office website for specific instructions on how to do this in your version of Microsoft Word).

Editorial Modification and Copyright

AUSS reserves the right to make necessary modifications to articles that have been submitted in order to comply with the journal's content and style. After the referee process, authors of articles edited for publication will receive an electronic copy (PDF) in pages, as it is intended to be published. Authors will carefully review the article and provide a prompt formal response accepting it "as-is" or detailing any necessary changes and corrections (making sure to reference a page, line, and/or footnote number for each change). Authors will also be asked to sign the accompanying copyright release form.

Publication Follow-up

Following the publication of an article, *AUSS* sends an electronic copy (PDF) of it in pages and two complimentary copies of the *AUSS* issue in which the article appears to the author.

Submission Preparation Checklist for Articles

As part of the submission process, authors are required to check off their submission's compliance with all of the following items. Submissions that do not adhere to these guidelines may be returned to the authors.

- The submission has not been previously published and is not before another journal for consideration.
- The submission is in Microsoft Word format.
- The text is doubled-spaced; single-spaced between sentences; uses a twelve-point font; employs italics, rather than underlining; and all illustrations, figures, and tables are placed within the text at the appropriate points, rather than at the end.
- The text adheres to the stylistic and bibliographic requirements outlined in the "Style and Formatting" section.
- The instructions in the "Ensuring a Blind Referee Process" section were followed.

Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 54, No. 2, 201–204.

BOOK REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Thank you for considering *Andrews University Seminary Studies* (*AUSS*) as a potential publishing outlet for your book review. *AUSS* strives for the highest quality in publishing content. Therefore, please take a few moments to review the following publishing guidelines. Book reviews that do not conform to these guidelines will be returned to the reviewer for corrections. Books received in the areas of *AUSS* interest (see masthead) may be assigned for review by the editorial team. Interested persons may contact the Book Review Manager to request or recommend books for review.

Content and Method

A book review should summarize the main content of the book and provide a critique, the latter usually being given the larger amount of space. Brief reference to the author's background and qualifications is also useful.

The review should be evaluative. It may compare the book with others of similar topic, as well as with other books written by the author. Footnotes are not to be used; any needed references are to be incorporated into the text in parentheses. Long quotations from the book are discouraged. All quotations must be followed by the exact page reference in parentheses and should not include the abbreviation p(p). before it. Reviews must maintain courteous language, free from invectives of any kind. The basic outline for a review should contain the following sections: introduction, evaluation, and conclusion.

The introduction should begin with a full bibliographical reference. Author (last name first). *Title*. Place of publication: Publisher, Date of publication. Number of pages (Roman numerals + Arabic numerals). Hard (or soft) cover. Price. Identify the author, and place both the author and the title in the context of earlier works in the same field of study. State the author's main argument briefly in very specific terms.

In the evaluation section, describe and evaluate the sources from which the author derived his/her information (primary or secondary, many or few). Then evaluate the development of the author's argument. How well does the author succeed in carrying out the stated purpose of the book? List and comment on the book's strengths and weaknesses.

The conclusion should give your judgment on the general value of the book and the type of reader who will likely find it useful.

Book reviews of symposia, *Festschriften*, and collected essays can be treated within the prescribed length limits by listing the titles of the articles and selecting for special treatment a few articles in which the reviewer is specifically interested or that fall into the specialty area of her/his expertise.

Preferred Length

AUSS prefers book reviews with 800–1,500 words. No more than half of the review should be used to describe the contents of the book; the rest should be used for evaluation and comment. Reviewers should use precise language, clear syntax, and avoid unreasonably long and complex sentences.

Style Manual

For style matters and scholarly abbreviations, *AUSS* uses Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). For cases of ambiguity or those not covered in *SBL Handbook of Style*, follow University of Chicago, *The Chicago Manual of Style: The Essential Guide for Writers, Editors, and Publishers*, 16th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010) and Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*, 8th ed., rev. Wayne C. Booth et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013). For spelling, authors may refer to Philip Babcock Gove, ed., *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 2002).

Style and Formatting

Manuscripts for articles should be double-spaced (except footnotes and indented quotations), have one-inch margins, and be left-justified. Excessive formatting should be avoided, with only block quotations, tables, figures, headings, and subheadings included. Tabs should be used rather than single spacing or first-line indentation. Sentences should have only a single space between them. Tables should be formed using standardized table templates provided in the author's word-processing software. The motto for formatting is, "Keep it simple!" Please note the formatting techniques that follow.

Quotations

Quotations longer than five lines are to be indented and single-spaced. Spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and abbreviations must be reproduced exactly as in the original and care should be taken to preserve the original author's intent. When making omissions in quotations, the use of ellipses should follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.1.3. However, the format of the ellipses themselves should *not* follow the handbook but instead include one space before and after each period (e.g., . . . , rather than ...). A space should also be placed between ellipses and original punctuation. Ellipses normally should not be used at the beginning or end of a quotation.

Citations and Abbreviations

Citations and abbreviations for all biblical, classical, and patristic literature, Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts, Targumic material, Mishnaic and Rabbinic

literature, Nag Hammadi Tractates, and journals, periodicals, and major reference works should follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 8.2–8.4.

For biblical references, no period is used following the abbreviations; a colon is used between chapter and verse. Biblical references should be placed in parentheses in the text of the article, rather than in footnotes (see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.1.8.3, 8.2–8.3.1). Citations of classical and patristic literature should follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed.

The following abbreviations should be used in parenthetical or footnote references. The terms should be spelled out when they occur in the text.

ch(s).	chapter(s)	n(n).	note(s)
col(s).	column(s)	pl(s).	plate(s)
frag(s).	fragment(s)	v(v).	verse(s)

Biblical Languages

Greek and Hebrew fonts are generally preferred rather than transliteration. Transliteration should be used primarily for ancient nonbiblical languages. Due to the problem of font compatibility, *AUSS* accepts only unicode fonts. Before submitting Greek and Hebrew in other fonts or transliterations, please query the editors for directions.

Dates

The format of dates in footnotes should follow the day-month-year system with the name of the month spelled out (e.g., 23 September 2016; see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.3.7.1). Inclusive dates should use all digits for all years (e.g., 1857–1868, rather than 1857–68; see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.2.5). Abbreviations for chronological eras should follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 8.1.2 (e.g., 457 BC or AD 325).

Hyphens and Dashes

SBL Handbook of Style, 2nd ed., 2.1.3.4, should be followed when using hyphens and dashes. Hyphens (-) are generally used to form certain compound terms, especially compound adjectives. En dashes (–) should be used when representing a span or range of numbers (i.e., page numbers [e.g., 36–42] or textual references [e.g., John 1:1–3]) and dates (e.g., 1963–2016) and also can be used between words to represent conflict, connection, or direction (e.g., "liberal–conservative debate"). Em dashes (—) can be used for phrases or clauses that interupt the flow of a sentence and are normally set apart by commas, parentheses, or colons. Spaces should not be placed between the hyphen or dash and the words or numbers that they connect.

Numbers

When used in nontechnical contexts, whole numbers zero through one hundred and ordinal numbers that are used in stentences should be spelled

out and follow *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.2.1–4.2.2. Ordinal numbers that are used in citations of sources with more than one edition, reprints, etc. should not have superscripted letters (e.g., 2nd ed., rather than 2nd ed.; see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 8.4). Arabic numbers (1, 10) are preferred over roman numerals (I, X). For exceptions, see *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed., 4.2.2. Number ranges should be all-inclusive (e.g., 234–239; 1964–1967, rather than 234–39; 1964–67).

Submission

After the reviewer has agreed to review a book, the book review should be submitted within three months. Book reviews should be prepared in Microsoft Word and may be submitted by uploading them onto the submission webpage on the *AUSS* website (www.andrews.edu/auss). The "Submit Manuscript" link in the sidebar directs to the submission webpage. Please note that you will be prompted to create an online account (e-mail address and password) with *AUSS*, if you do not have one already.

Editorial Modification

AUSS reserves the right to make necessary modifications to book reviews that have been submitted in order to comply with the journal's content and style. Reviewers of book reviews edited for publication will receive an electronic copy (PDF) in pages, as it is intended to be published. Reviewers will carefully read the book review and provide a prompt formal response accepting it "as-is" or detailing any necessary changes and corrections (making sure to reference a page and line number for each change).

Publication Follow-up

Following the publication of a book review, *AUSS* sends electronic copies (PDF) to the reviewer and to the publisher of the book.

S*ubmission Preparation Checklist for Book Reviews*

As part of the submission process, reviewers are required to check off their submission's compliance with all of the following items. Submissions that do not adhere to these guidelines may be returned to the reviewers.

- The submission is in Microsoft Word format.
- The text is doubled-spaced; single-spaced between sentences; uses a twelve-point font; and employs italics, rather than underlining.
- The text adheres to the stylistic and bibliographic requirements outlined in these guidelines.

Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 54, No. 2, 205–235.

SCHEMATIZED OR NON-SCHEMATIZED: THE GENEALOGIES OF GENESIS 5 AND 11

Bernard White
Sahmyook University
Seoul, South Korea

Even among evangelicals, it is now commonplace to understand the opening chapters of Genesis in the light of current scientific paradigms—specifically Darwinian evolution. Scholarly support for this understanding inevitably involves fresh exegetical approaches to Gen 1 and 2.[1] Often absent from the discussions is a consideration of the genealogies of Gen 5 and 11. Taken at face value, the numerical data associated with each generation in these two genealogies suggest a time scale for earth's history in terms of thousands rather than millions or billions of years. Such a brief time scale is hopelessly at odds not only with the widely-accepted evolutionary schema but also with historical and archaeological discoveries, such that the evident assertions of Gen 5 and 11 are little heeded in the scholarly literature.[2]

Yet the assertions are there, and responsible biblical exegesis is mandated by that simple fact. Where efforts are made to grapple with the material of these two chapters, attention is often focused on demonstrating that schematization of some kind has occurred, whether involving the number of names included in each of the two genealogies or the numerical data associated with those names. The implication, of course, is that schematized numbers are not natural numbers and schematized lists of names do not accurately represent the chronological facts of history: consequently, the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies cannot be used as part of a biblical chronology. For the most part, such approaches are admittedly not intended to prove Scripture to be in error

[1]A great many books have been published on or around the subject. Among the more recent are Charles Halton, ed., *Genesis: History, Fiction, or Neither? Three Views on the Bible's Earliest Chapters* in Counterpoints Series (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015); Matthew Barrett and Ardel B. Caneday, eds., *Four Views on The Historical Adam* in Counterpoints Series (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013); J. Daryl Charles, *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013); John C. Lennox, *Seven Days That Divide the World: The Beginning According to Genesis and Science* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011); John H. Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009); David G. Hagopian, *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*, (Mission Viejo, CA: Crux, 2001).

[2]Even a scholar such as C. John Collins, who is at least willing to accept the essential historicity of Adam and Eve, finds little reason to accord the early genealogies a second glance. Accepting without argument that the genealogy of Gen 5 (and 4) has gaps, he states that he knows of "no way to ascertain what size gaps these genealogies allow. . . . There is, therefore, good reason to steer away from the idea that Genesis 4–5 makes any kind of claim about the dates of the events and people involved." See his *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist? Who They Were and Why You Should Care* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011), 115.

so much as to provide support for the view that Scripture, rightly understood, need not be considered in conflict with science.[3]

Yet logical and exegetical difficulties with these revisionist approaches are not allayed by the sincerity that lies behind them. In two previous articles I have focused on the function of the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies, noted the interrelationship of genealogy and narrative in Genesis, and attempted to tease out exegetical clues that support the integrity of the numerical data of those two genealogies.[4] In the present paper I wish to focus more specifically on the outstanding issue of schematization. That the number of names and the numerical data associated with them appear to be non-random is a feature of the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies that cannot be brushed aside. Suggestions that the data have been purposely manipulated, or even contrived, in order to create certain patterns need to be closely examined. The proposition that the numbers hide a purposeful numerical scheme needs to be put to the test. Here this will be done through one representative sexagesimal scheme, that suggested by Carol Hill: Does the scheme work—that is, is it able to account for the origin of the genealogical data—and can it be proved? There is, in addition, the issue of special numbers, and patterns in the presentation of names based on special numbers such as seven and ten. Does the presence of such numbers and patterns suggest purposeful schematization on the part of the human author? Do these argue for a written document that owes more to human scheme and imagination than to divine inspiration? Finally, is there evidence in the Bible to support the alternative proposition that the patterns of names and numbers in the genealogies might have been determined by providence rather than by human scheme?

Before approaching these specific questions, it will be necessary first to consider the general characteristics of schematization, then to review briefly the previous work of one eminent theologian whose pioneering efforts in this field should not be overlooked.

Schematization Defined

Whenever a set of facts or numbers is simplified for the sake of presentation, usually accomplished by paring the data or formularizing it, we may say that schematization has occurred. This simple schematization allows the presenter to quickly focus attention on the essential features or message of the data—or on features that the presenter wishes to highlight—and may be accomplished with minimal alteration to the original data. Rounding of numbers or

[3]Gerhard F. Hasel, while arguing that the names and numbers of the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies are *not* schematized, nevertheless acknowledges that some of the suggested schemes do at least represent "serious attempts to find meaning in the figures. . . . The figures are not simply dismissed as meaningless" ("The Meaning of the Chronogenealogies of Genesis 5 and 11," *Origins* 7.2 [1980], 65; a similar comment is made in ibid., 64).

[4]See White, "Revisiting Genesis 5 and 11: A Closer Look at the Chronogenealogies" *AUSS* 53.2 (2015): 253–277; "Adam to Joshua: Tracing A Paragenealogy," *AUSS* 54.1 (2016): 3–29.

the selection and omission of nonessential material would fall under this definition. More complex schematization may seek to radically adjust or add to the original data in order to make them conform to a preconceived plan (or scheme). With respect to the biblical genealogies, purported sexagesimal systems or following a system of jubilee years would be examples of complex schematization. A scheme might involve working with existing material: shaping, editing, and arranging it so that it conforms to a preordained scheme. But it does not necessarily involve working with a prior text; there is the possibility that a scheme, and the material it uses, is an original, fictional work, perhaps based loosely on historical material.

Schematization and Pattern

Because of human nature's fondness for order and structure, schematization often results in a patterned arrangement of the material that is both visually and audibly pleasing and at the same time easier to remember. Schematization and pattern, however, are not the same. The first may very often result in the second, but there is no logical requirement to insist that the second is necessarily the result of the first.

In nature, for example, patterns can be produced by random forces, wind-blown patterns in the sand on a beach being but one example.[5] In literature, patterns are much less likely to be the result of chance since literature, in contrast to the random forces of nature, proceeds from an intelligent mind acting with artistic design and teleological intent. When it comes to the literary genre of historical narrative, the presence of patterns in the literature are likely to raise suspicions of schematization for the simple reason that historical events—at least in their minutiae—tend not to occur in patterns. When, therefore, it is observed that the Bible records just ten generations from Adam to Noah (Gen 5) and exactly ten more from Noah's son Shem to Abram (Gen 11); that the terminal generation in both of these genealogies has three siblings; that the age data supplied for each generation appear strikingly nonrandom; that the age data of Shem mirror (in a sense) the age data of Noah; and that rather special-looking numbers such as 365, 777, and 500 are attached to significant figures such as Enoch, Lamech and Noah—when these facts are observed, the question does arise as to whether these nominal and numerical data might in fact be artificial or contrived.[6]

[5]Snowflakes, in their seemingly infinite variety (and beauty), are another. It has been determined that these patterns are the product of physical forces acting randomly. This fact, however, does not automatically exclude God's role in their production. Why might not the Creator have established such forces that would, under certain conditions, continually generate unique (and beautiful) patterns?

[6]These observations pertaining to apparent schematization, as well as additional material outlined by Laurence Turner (see n. 42, below), are not new. William Henry Green, in the late nineteenth century, seems to have been the first to posit gaps in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies as a way of harmonizing them with the evidence for much larger time scales ("Primeval Chronology," *BSac* 47 [April 1890]: 285–303). His argument was based in part upon the "regularity" of the lists: "The structure of

But first impressions must not be allowed to evolve unexamined into dogma. On the one hand, what might at first appear to be a simple pattern may turn out to be otherwise. On the other hand, purported schemes intended to account for the patterns may prove to be deficient in their explanatory power. Importantly, we must remember that it is the word of God that we are handling. It is not just that Scripture is an inspired record of a religious history; it is that Scripture is a record of God's acts and words in a particular history. At a minimum, this must mean that historical events are not always as random as we might imagine. It may even be that some patterns of names and numbers in the historical record came about in the first place by the guiding hand of divine providence. Unless one denies that God is active in human affairs, the possibility of God's involvement is not something that can legitimately be excluded a priori; that possibility certainly should be, and here will be, given some consideration.

Schematization and the Earlier Work of Gerhard F. Hasel

It is several decades since OT scholar Gerhard F. Hasel explored the question of supposed schematization (or systematization) in the genealogies of Gen 5 and 11.[7] Hasel's focus was essentially twofold. His first concern was with the textual history of the various ancient texts—specifically the Masoretic Text (MT), the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), and the Septuagint (LXX). Hasel's comparative analysis of these texts led him to conclude that the SP and (especially) the LXX in their various recensions show strong evidence of schematization; they stand in marked contrast to the MT. To Hasel, this suggests that the MT ought to be given priority over the other texts. This is because textual emendation is more likely to move in the direction of irregularity to regularity, schematization, and pattern than to purposely create irregularity where previously there was pattern. His conclusion bears repeating: "If it is possible to convince oneself that the purpose of the MT is to bring irregularity and non-system out of regularity, schematization and

---

the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 . . . favors the belief that they do not register all the names in these respective lines of descent. Their regularity seems to indicate intentional arrangement" (ibid., 302). He states further that "it seems in the highest degree probable that the symmetry of these primitive genealogies is artificial rather than natural. It is much more likely that this definite number of names fitting into a regular scheme has been selected as sufficiently representing the periods to which they belong, than that all these striking numerical coincidences should have happened to occur in these successive instances" (ibid.).

[7]See Hasel "Genesis 5 and 11: Chronogenealogies in the Biblical History of Beginnings," *Origins* 7.1 (1980): 23–37; idem, "The Meaning of the Chronogenealogies of Genesis 5 and 11," 53–70 (see n. 3, above). Travis R. Freeman is another theologian who has questioned the common assumption of schematization. See his "The Genesis 5 and 11 Fluidity Question," *Tyndale Journal* 19.2 (2005): 83–90. Freeman nevertheless deals only briefly with the narrower question of schematization (ibid., 86–88).

system, then both the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch may be conceived to have priority over the Hebrew text."[8]

Although, as Hasel admits, one cannot claim with certainty that the MT has priority, the evidence does point in that direction. Yet even if the priority of the MT is accepted, it would be a mistake to suggest that the MT itself shows no evidence of schematization. There, in the most widely read OT text, one may readily find pattern, the use of special numbers (the "sevens," both overt and hidden), and what appear to be rounded numbers. These phenomena, too, need to be addressed.

In a second article, Hasel explored the meaning of the numbers. Among other things, this led to an analysis of various scholarly efforts that had attempted to demonstrate that the genealogical data were highly schematized. His conclusion was that "the disparity between the various systems has not recommended them to many scholars."[9] Perhaps so. But that some degree of schematization is a characteristic of the genealogies seems still to be a common assumption. This is not surprising, given that both the nominal and numerical data in these lists certainly appear to contain patterns and nonrandom numbers, raising the legitimate suspicion of schematization. Furthermore, despite Hasel's fairly rigorous critique of purported numerical systems, the idea that the biblical writer did indeed employ some form of system continues to be promoted. One of these—a sexagesimal system suggested by Carol Hill—will be appraised here in some detail. Additionally, other commonly recognized indications of schematization of names and numbers will be explored.

It is not necessary here either to assume Hasel's findings or to attempt to confirm or refute them. In the first place, my intention is to work simply with the MT, being that with which most readers are familiar. If, as Hasel finds, the MT shows less evidence of schematization than either the SP or the LXX, there is still in the MT sufficient grounds for claiming schematization

[8]Hasel, "Genesis 5 and 11," 36. W. H. Green, though strongly denying that the Genesis genealogies have any chronological value, and setting forth many of the now-familiar arguments of schematization and compression, nevertheless accepted without debate the priority of the MT (Green, "Primeval Chronology," 300–302). A contrasting position is taken by Robert M. Best, who argues on the basis of age ratios. Specifically, the ratio between age at begetting and age at death is today usually between 4 and 6. So a young man having a first child at age twenty and subsequently dying at age eighty demonstrates a ratio of 4. Begetting a first child at age eighteen and finally expiring at the ripe old age of 108 demonstrates a ratio of 6. The genealogical data as found in the LXX produce ratios consistent with those of today, while the figures found in the MT and SP produce ratios of up to 13.77. Clearly, according to Best, such ratios are not possible. See his *Noah's Ark and the Ziusudra Epic: Sumerian Origins of the Flood Myth* (Fort Myers, FL: Enlil Press, 1999), 106–107. Obviously, Best does not consider the possibility that lifespans in the early years of earth's history might have been considerably longer than those of today, allowing for much larger ratios.

[9]Hasel, "Meaning of the Chronogenealogies," 65.

and sufficient material with which to explore that charge.[10] Additionally, the arguments offered here may be seen as complementary to those penned by Hasel, less because they take his arguments further than that they broach aspects of the subject that he did not explore in detail.

The Question of a Ten-Ten Pattern of Names in Gen 5 and 11

A symmetrical ten-ten pattern of the names in the antediluvian-postdiluvian genealogical lists is accepted without demur by most scholars.[11] Few have questioned this general assumption.[12] Those who have questioned it have pointed out that, while there certainly are ten names from Adam to Noah and ten more from Shem to Abram, the actual genealogical lists, when viewed together, do not present a ten-ten pattern. The Gen 5 genealogy actually ends not with Noah, but with his three sons, making eleven generations in total. The Gen 11 genealogy also ends with three sons, among whom Abram is one,

[10]That systematization of the genealogical data did occur at some point in Israel's history can hardly be doubted. Variations between the OT texts is particularly evident in the numerical data and may in many cases indicate attempts to systematize the figures to conform to a preconceived scheme. But there is a need to think carefully about how to interpret this obvious phenomenon. Two questions, especially, must be considered: (1) Was the *original* text the product of such a scheme, or did it contain real numbers that were later schematized? (2) Does any pattern in the names or numbers automatically indicate fabrication or systematization?

[11]Examples abound: "Each genealogy presented in chapters 5 and 11 of Genesis includes ten names. Adam to Noah contains ten names and Shem to Abraham contains ten names. To break a text into a ten-generational pattern was common for many Near Eastern people-groups of that time" (Carol A. Hill, "Making Sense of the Numbers of Genesis," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 55.4 [2003]: 246); "There are ten generations from Adam through Noah . . . and ten more from Shem through Abraham" (E. H. Merrill, "Chronology," *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003], 118–119); "The ten generations from Adam to Noah are paralleled by a like number separating Noah from Adam" (N. M. Sarna, "Genesis, Book of," *EncJud* 7:397); "The genealogies between Adam and Noah, and Noah and Abraham, are each set up to contain ten members, with the last having three sons" (John H. Walton, Victor H. Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000], 35). In addition to the aspect of symmetry when comparing the two lists of names, the mere fact that Noah is tenth is itself seen by some to indicate artificiality. Dwight Young, for example, notes that "[Noah] is also tenth in the line of antediluvian Patriarchs. This tradition is doubtless dependent upon a Mesopotamian source. It is especially reminiscent of a notation in the writings of Berossus (third century BCE), according to which the hero of the great flood was Babylonia's tenth antediluvian king" (Young, "Noah," *EncJud* 15:287).

[12]Travis R. Freeman, citing S. R. Külling, notes that most scholars seem to have "overlooked" the fact that the genealogies are not really symmetrical (Freeman, "A New Look at the Genesis 5 and 11 Fluidity Problem," *AUSS* 42.2 [2004]: 273). Hasel had already pointed out that there was "no schematic ten-ten sequence" in his "Meaning of the Chronogenealogies," 60.

but the total number of generations is only ten (in the MT).[13] The following table allows one to see this at a glance:

(7th)		Enoch			Serug	
(8th)		Methuselah			Nahor	
(9th)		Lamech			Terah	
(10th)		Noah		Abram	Nahor	Haran
(11th)	Shem	Ham	Japheth		——	

If one were to insist that the first antediluvian genealogy should be considered to end with Noah, the last father, making only ten generations, one would have to do similarly with the genealogy of Gen 11. In that case the second genealogy would have only nine generations and would end not with Abram, but with Terah, the last father in the list. It is either an eleven-ten pattern or a ten-nine pattern, which amounts, in either case, to an undeniable asymmetry.[14]

The observation that a neat ten-ten pattern does not survive even moderate scrutiny appears, initially, to be correct. But to conclude from this that there is no pattern, or scheme, would be incorrect. As I have demonstrated in a previous article, what needs to be recognized is that there is a system of patterns functioning on three levels.[15] By re-presenting the above table, the three-fold pattern is clearly apparent.

[13]Some recensions of the LXX have an additional name (Cainan, between Shelah and Arphaxad; cf. Lk 3:36), resulting in a symmetrical list of ten names. The tenth in both cases is the father of three sons. In this case, however, Abram can in no sense be considered parallel with Noah; see the discussion that follows (main text). I am indebted to Rodger C. Young for the following additional comment: "Cainan as a son of Arphaxad, however, is not found in the oldest extant MS that contains Luke 3:36, the Bodmer Papyrus $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, nor is this name in the Samaritan Pentateuch or Josephus. Possibly later editors of the LXX added the name in order to achieve a (false) harmony, making eleven generations from Noah to Abraham to compare with the eleven generations from Adam to Noah. Scribes copying the NT, who were generally familiar with the LXX but who did not read Hebrew, would have 'corrected' Luke's supposed omission to be in harmony with the artificial schematization of the LXX" (Rodger C. Young, personal correspondence with the author, 13 July 2016).

[14]It is unlikely that any scholar working in this field today is unaware of this asymmetry. But the fact is often glossed over in order to promote the ten-ten scheme. Carol Hill, having noted that there are just ten names from Adam to Noah and ten more from Shem to Abraham (see n. 11 above), states that "in addition, the description of each of these ten generations ends with a father having three sons" ("Making Sense," 246). Technically, this is correct. But one may observe the careful wording that allows the writer to state what is true while, unfortunately, giving the impression of something that is *not* true: that the two genealogies have a happy symmetry in their presentation of these ten generations. The simple fact is, they do not. A similar observation can be made about the statement of Walton, Matthews, and Chavalas (see n. 11, above).

[15]Compare White, "Revisiting Genesis 5 and 11," 269n42.

First Parallel

(7th)		Enoch			Serug	
(8th)		Methuselah			Nahor	
(9th)		Lamech			Terah	
(**10th**)		**Noah**		**Abram**	Nahor	Haran
(11th)	Shem	Ham	Japheth		——	

Second Parallel

(7th)		Enoch			Serug	
(8th)		Methuselah			Nahor	
(9th)		Lamech			Terah	
(**10th**)		Noah		**Abram**	Nahor	Haran
(**11th**)	**Shem**	Ham	Japheth		——	

Third Parallel

(7th)		Enoch			Serug	
(8th)		Methuselah			Nahor	
(**9th**)		Lamech			**Terah**	
(**10th**)		**Noah**		*Abram*	*Nahor*	*Haran*
(*11th*)	*Shem*	*Ham*	*Japheth*		——	

In the first place, Noah and Abram are parallel. They are the tenth, and most important, figures in their respective lines. Abram is also parallel with Shem: they both are one of the three sons with whom each genealogy formally ends; in each case they are mentioned first, although it is by no means certain that they were actually the firstborn sons;[16] and they both are the figures through whom the godly line is continued. Third, as the final fathers in their respective lists, Noah and Terah, too, are parallel figures.

Each of the three parallels serves a particular end. The first presents two seminal figures in salvation history. With Noah, the old world ended; with Abram, the nation of Israel began. Through the Flood, God purges his people by removing the wicked from among them. With Abram, God purges his people by removing them from the wicked. Thus, the first parallel bespeaks God's work in preserving a godly line upon the earth. The second and third parallels both serve as literary features that connect and unify the genealogical and narrative material of Genesis.[17] For the genealogy of Gen 5 is interrupted

[16]There is some room for difference of opinion on this point. The position taken here is that, if Shem was one hundred years old "two years after the flood" (Gen 11:10), he must have been born when Noah was 502 years old, making him probably the second son (cf. Gen 5:32; 7:6, 11). Similarly, if Abram was seventy-five years old at the death of his father, the latter must have been 130 years old when Abram was born (cf. Gen 11:26, 31–32; 12:4; Acts 7:4). It is not a vital point. What can be stated is that in both cases—Noah's sons and Terah's sons—there is some ambiguity.

[17]The narrative material relating to Noah and Abraham is largely concerned with God's work to establish on the earth a people who "call upon the name of the Lord." The genealogical material exhibits a similar concern, and does so on two fronts. First, it bears witness to the fact that there has been no generation since Adam in which God

by the Flood narrative, in which Noah is the main figure. But following this lengthy interlude (Gen 6:1–11:9), the genealogy continues, relaunched by Noah's son Shem. This second phase of the genealogy is similarly interrupted, this time by a shorter interlude (Gen 11:27–32). In this interlude, it is again the final father of the genealogy, Terah, who is the main figure. Once more, it is the first-mentioned son, Abram, who then relaunches the genealogy. But the genealogy now slows down to allow time for much more detail: it has become a narrative.[18] Again, a diagram will make more apparent the connection between these second and third parallels (Shem/Abram and Noah/Terah) and their particular function in the interplay of narrative and genealogy:

Noah	**Shem**	Interlude I (*Noah*)	**Shem**
(chronology/genealogy continues from Shem in GENEALOGY form)			
Terah	**Abram**	Interlude II (*Terah*)	**Abram**
(chronology/genealogy continues from Abram in NARRATIVE form)			

The point of this is that there clearly is a patterned arrangement in the names that appear in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies. The total number of generations, the existence and grouping of the three sons born to the final fathers, and the resulting threefold parallel form a complex pattern that is unlikely to be accidental or coincidental. Especially, the theological and literary connections engendered by the presence and placement of the names are integral to the overall meaning of the story at this point. This suggests purpose and design.

But are we to conclude from this that the data have been "fiddled" with—that the writer perhaps selected from a larger list the nine or ten names he wanted to include in each of the two genealogies, and that, however many sons Noah and Terah might really have had, the writer selected just three in

---

has not had such a people to uphold his name. The purpose of the tightly overlapping numerical data of the genealogies is not simply to establish the fact of immediate biological succession from generation to generation *for its own sake*. It is that God may be glorified in demonstrating his ability to maintain a people on the earth *in every generation* despite the prevailing wickedness. That is why the genealogy slows down with Noah to become a narrative: what God has been doing in every generation is exemplified and brought to its apotheosis in the story of Noah. The theme of the narrative is not disconnected from the theme of the genealogy out of which it grows and to which it belongs. A second way in which the genealogical material is concerned with God's work to establish and maintain the godly line is through the chronological emphasis evident in the all-pervading numerical data. Once again, those data are not there for their own sake—not primarily as data by which to calculate the age of the earth—but as witness to the fact that God's program in salvation history would proceed according to God's timetable (on which, there is more below in the section on "God's Providence in the Numbers"). This interrelationship—the essential oneness—between narrative and genealogical concerns is reinforced by the system of parallels noted here.

[18]See White, "Adam to Joshua," 4–5.

each case? On this question, it will be helpful to consider the three sons born to both Noah and Terah.

The Three Sons in the Final Generation of Each Genealogy

The details found in the flood narrative (the first interlude) emphasize that Noah had just three sons who entered with him into the ark. The same three then propagated the various races that repopulated the earth after the flood.[19] And what of Terah's family? It is possible to imagine that the father of Abram had more than three sons, the extra names not being supplied by the biblical writer. But it is far from likely. The impression given from the second interlude (Gen 11:27–32) is that of a fairly comprehensive listing of family members known to the writer. Why else the mention of Haran's son Iscah (v. 29), who plays no role in this or any subsequent narrative? It would appear that his name is included only for the sake of completeness. In any case, in a pericope that is evidently given for the specific purpose of providing details of Terah's immediate family, it is hard to see why the biblical writer would have failed to name all of the patriarch's immediate children.[20]

It is, then, a very reasonable conclusion that the three sons named at the conclusion of the genealogies of Gen 5 and 11 are not contrived in order to present a scheme. It simply happens to be that both Noah and Terah had three sons each.[21] Coincidences do happen, and the existence of a pattern does not demand the conclusion that schematization has occurred.[22] This needs to

[19]Compare also 1 Pet 3:20, which has only eight individuals saved in the Flood.

[20]Additional, circumstantial evidence for the completeness of the biblical record regarding Terah's sons is found in two subsequent accounts that seem to recognize no other siblings of Abram besides Haran and Nahor. When it was time to find a wife for Isaac, Abraham instructed his servant, "Go to my country and to my family" (Gen 24:4, NKJV). The servant consequently headed for Nahor's home (Gen 24:10), giving no indication that he had any other options besides this one relative. And when Jacob, fleeing from his brother Esau, arrived in the same land and encountered a group of shepherds from Haran, he asked only, "Do you know Laban the son of Nahor?" (Gen 29:5). Again, no other family line is recognized or enquired after.

[21]This is not to say that Noah might not have had other sons either prior to, or following, his entering the ark. It is conceivable that he had older sons who went the way of the wicked, refusing to enter the ark. Were that the case, it does not change the fact that *only three* sons were saved from the pre-flood world and repopulated the post-flood world.

[22]Hill, who argues for schematization in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies, acknowledges that "this is not to say that Noah or Terah or Cain [who is also recorded as having three sons] did not have three (or more) sons, or that these sons were not real historical people. It is to say that the biblical writer mentioned only these sons so that the text was made numerically symmetrical and harmonious within the overall framework of religious intent" ("Making Sense," 246). This is inadequate. The text portrays that Noah had only three sons who went with him into the ark and from whom the earth was repopulated. They were not selected for mention by the writer in order to introduce symmetry. To the contrary, their inclusion in the genealogy, as will be subsequently explained here, introduces asymmetry.

be kept in mind when we later consider the numerical data of the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies.

Another question arises, however. Why did the writer decide to include the two sets of siblings in the genealogies in the first place? For doing so profoundly disturbs the ten-ten pattern that would otherwise have existed. That is: logically, the genealogies should have ended simply with Noah on the one hand, and with Abram on the other, thus:

(7th)	Enoch	Serug
(8th)	Methuselah	Nahor
(9th)	Lamech	Terah
(**10th**)	**Noah**	**Abram**

That is symmetry! If symmetry and a ten-ten pattern had been the writer's schematic aim, he had all he needed with these names. Yet he chooses to disturb this striking balance by adding an extra generation to the first genealogy, creating a lopsidedness that is not diminished by the corresponding inclusion of siblings in Abram's generation (one generation earlier). So why? If, as many seem to believe, the writer had from a larger list selected just ten names for the generations from Adam to Noah and ten more for Shem to Abram, why would he then spoil his own scheme by creating a lopsided list? Strictly speaking, the extra siblings are not even part of the godly line and therefore do not belong in the genealogies. If schematization were the aim, the writer would surely not have wanted to include them. All that needed to be said about them is found in the narrative interludes (Gen 6–10; 11:27–32), making redundant their misplaced appearance in the genealogies. Again, if schematization were the aim, and if contriving names were acceptable, the writer might easily have selected (or invented) two siblings for Noah's generation. He would then have achieved a perfectly symmetrical pair of genealogies, thus:

(7th)		Enoch			Serug	
(8th)		Methuselah			Nahor	
(9th)		Lamech			Terah	
(**10th**)	**Noah**	[Sibling]	[Sibling]	**Abram**	Nahor	Haran

None of this proves that the biblical writer did not omit names from these genealogies. But the suggestion that artful schematization is implied by the existence of a ten-ten pattern is, on closer examination, seen to be poorly conceived. There are patterns, to be sure—and more complex than the simple ten-ten pattern that most have supposed—but they do not show evidence of having been constructed either by the falsification of names or by the omission of any.

Nevertheless, the complex of patterns does appear purposeful in that it serves a theological end. If schematization of names is rejected, one may conclude either (1) that the writer of Genesis discovered the inherent patterns and realized how they could be arranged to serve a theological purpose, or (2) that it was the divine Author who conceived the arrangement, with its

theological purpose, and inspired the biblical writer to include the names that he did, the human author possibly being unaware of the divine purpose. The second of these suggestions carries with it the implication that the number of generations from Adam to Noah and from Shem to Abram was exactly ten by God's providence; and so, too, the number of children born to Noah and Terah. This possibility will be considered at a later point in this article.[23]

The issue of schematization of names is, however, complicated by the character of the numerical data connected with these same names. The patterns evident in this second set of data again raises suspicion of schematization. And if the numerical data are schematized, it becomes more awkward to insist that the names themselves are not. It is to the numerical data that we now turn.

Questioning Schematization of Numbers in Gen 5 and 11

In connection with the schematization question, the numbers in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies present us with slightly different problems. One relates to their apparent nonrandomness, a second to the possible use of some form of numerical system, and a third to the astonishing presence of special-looking numbers such as 777 and 365. They will be considered here in that order.

The Issue of Nonrandomness

No argument is required to establish that the numerical data of Gen 5 and 11 display some degree of nonrandomness. Of the forty numbers for the pregenerative and postgenerative years of both lists, the last digit of nineteen of these is 0, while a further eight have 5 as the final digit. Digits 1, 6, and 8 are not represented at all. The remaining five possible digits are represented only thirteen times in total. Even though the sample is small, it seems extremely unlikely that just two out of the ten possible final digits would account for 67.5 percent (27 out of 40) of the total sample.

There are three possible reasons why any individual number might end in zero: (1) it is a natural number;[24] (2) it is a natural number that has been rounded; or (3) it is an artificial number. In respect to the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies as a whole, the first of these options can, with a fair degree of certainty, be dismissed on statistical grounds. The question then becomes: Are the pregenerative and postgenerative numbers natural numbers, some of which have been rounded, or are they artificial numbers where final digit zeros and fives were frequently selected in order to conform to a scheme? Walter Makous applies various statistical tools to the task of determining whether or not the numbers in these genealogies are artificial. He concludes that "all efforts to show that the numbers lack the properties of natural numbers failed; therefore,

[23]See the several consecutive sections below beginning with "God and Preferred Numbers."

[24]Hill, whose sexagesimal system will be analyzed below, refers to natural numbers as "real" numbers (Hill, "Making Sense," 239, 245).

one cannot reject the hypothesis that the numbers have a natural origin. This, of course, does not prove a natural origin; it simply fails to disprove it."[25]

While Makous believes his analysis shows that some numbers definitely have been rounded (a necessary conclusion if the numbers are not regarded as artificial), he adds that "one cannot say with confidence that any specific number has been rounded."[26] This suggests an interesting question, however. For even if it is clear that some numbers have been rounded, it is equally clear that many have not (namely, those thirteen numbers whose final digits are something other than 0 or 5). Why, then, would some numbers be rounded and not others? We have no idea, of course, at which point in the transmission process rounding might have occurred. It may in some instances have occurred at the very earliest point, due possibly to a natural or cultural preference for using particular digits when referring to age.[27] Or, during the long period of oral transmission, some numbers might have been rounded to make them easier to memorize. Other scenarios are possible.

The point is, we not only cannot be sure which numbers have been rounded; we also cannot know who rounded them. We cannot know if the individuals themselves recorded their own age when they gave birth to a particular son and recalled that age as a rounded number; whether a subsequent generation recalled the approximate age at which their father or grandfather begot a particular child; or whether the biblical writer chose to round some of the numbers. In short, our ignorance of how and when these numbers might have been rounded is total.

Regardless of who might have rounded some numbers and why they might have done so, the very fact that a disproportionate number seem to be rounded means that, taken as a whole, the numbers appear to be nonrandom and nonnatural. This fact makes it more difficult to arbitrate as to whether the numbers are real or artificial; for, as Makous notes, rounding "invalidates the computation of probabilities based on the assumption that the final digits of these numbers are random."[28]

[25]Walter Makous, "Biblical Longevities: Empirical Data or Fabricated Numbers?" *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 63.3 (2011): 124. Makous's interpretation of the statistical data was challenged by Donald A. Huebner in "Biblical Longevities: Some Questions and Issues," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 63.4 (2011): 287–288. Makous responded in "Biblical Longevities: Reply to Huebner," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 64.2 (2012): 143.

[26]Ibid., 123.

[27]In one statistical study, James L. Hayward and Donald E. Casebolt present the suggestion, as one of several options to account for the randomness of the numbers in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies, that "the biased age values may be due to digit preferences by those reporting age data." The authors cite one demographic study of reported age data from the Philippines in the year 1960. The data reveal a "strong preference for ages ending in '0,' with somewhat lesser preferences for ages ending in '5,' '2,' and '8.'" James L. Hayward and Donald E. Casebolt, "The Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11: A Statistical Study," *Origins* 9.2 (1982): 80.

[28]Makous, "Biblical Longevities," 123.

Still considering the pregenerative and postgenerative ages, of the twenty numbers for the Gen 5 group, fifteen have 0 or 5 as the last digit; of the twenty numbers for the Gen 11 group, only twelve do. The imbalance is not suggestive of artificiality or of schematization. On the presumption of artificiality, is it possible to explain why the biblical writer selected some names to carry the 0 or 5 digit, but not others? Why, for instance, did Cainan (70/840) and Mahalaleel (65/830) receive two rounded numbers, while Methuselah (187/782), distinguished above others on account of his superior longevity, received none? Why did Serug (30/200) receive two nicely rounded numbers, while his father Reu (32/207) and son Nahor (29/119) received none at all? There may be a reason why, but it is not apparent, and there seems no way of knowing it. And if the reason is inherently unknowable to the reader, why would the writer have contrived it?

The issue becomes irrelevant, however, if it is asserted that no rounding of real numbers has occurred. Instead—our third option that is mentioned above—the numbers are entirely artificial, created to form a scheme. Carol Hill is one who has strongly proposed such a scheme. It will here be considered in some detail, as representative of similar schemes.

Considerations of a Numerological Scheme

For Hill, the numbers in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies have a numerological purpose.[29] She believes the key to understanding these numbers is to see that the numerical data are based on both sacred numbers and preferred numbers. Sacred numbers, she claims, are obtained from the Mesopotamian sexagesimal system. Of these the most important is sixty, along with seven and, to a lesser degree, ten.[30] These numbers were particularly associated with mathematics

[29]Hill is simply one of a number of scholars who suggest a numerical scheme of one kind or another. As pointed out by P. G. Nelson, Hill appears to be following Umberto Cassuto in the idea that contemporary numerology lay behind the numerical data of Gen 5 and 11 (Nelson, "Numerology in Genesis," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 60.1 [March 2008]: 70.) Several numerological schemes have been analyzed by Hasel, as noted above. Evangelical scholar, John H. Walton, has cautiously posited the idea that when the *total* of the individual lifespans for the patriarchs of Gen 5 is converted to a sexagesimal number, it results in a figure similar to the total of the regnal lengths of one version of the Sumerian King List (SKL); see Walton, *Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989). Walton is able to achieve this by discounting both Adam and Noah (arguing that they have no parallel in the SKL), so that the remaining eight names in Gen 5 can be paralleled with the eight names from one particular version of the SKL. Additionally, the total of the Genesis names (6,695) is rounded (to 6,700) before converting it to the sexagesimal number. From the result, Walton concludes that "the two lists share a common link somewhere in their heritage" and that "if such a relationship exists, the Genesis 5 lists would be earlier" (ibid., 129). He admits that this "still gives no explanation for the variations between individuals, numbers, or the variations between the names" (ibid., 130).

[30]Hill, "Making Sense," 242.

and astronomy, and with texts relating to the affairs of "gods, kings, or persons of high standing."[31] In addition, "sacred numbers also fit into the Mesopotamians' world view of symmetry and harmony . . . . It was important to associate one's life with the right numbers . . . . Symbolic numbers were of highest value in religious texts because they were considered to be the carriers of ultimate truth and reality."[32] To be considered alongside these, in Hill's schema, are the biblical preferred numbers, especially three, seven, twelve, and forty.

Using both Mesopotamian sacred numbers and biblical preferred numbers, Hill produces a table showing that each of the sixty numbers from the genealogies of Gen 5 and 11 are the sum of these two types of numbers.[33] On examining the table, one is able to see that Hill has employed the numbers two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight(!), ten, fifteen(!), forty, and sixty—eleven numbers in all—in various combinations of multiplication, addition and subtraction. Let us extract two examples, those of Adam and Methuselah. I choose these two simply because of their mutual dissimilarity: all three of Adam's numbers as given in the biblical text end in zero, while none of Methuselah's three numbers end in either zero or five. Associated with each name is a pregenerative number, a postgenerative number, and an age at death. Thus:

Adam:	130 =	(60 x 2 yrs) + (60 x 2 mos)
	800 =	(60 x 10 x 10 mos) + (60 x 60 mos)
	930 =	(60 x 3 x 5 yrs) x 60mos + (6 x 5 yrs) x (60mos)
Methuselah:	187 =	(60 x 3 yrs) + 7 yrs
	782 =	(60 x 10 x 10 mos) + (60 x 60 mos) - (6 x 3 yrs)
	969 =	(60 + 60 + 60 + 6 + 6) x 60 mos - 5 yrs (60 mos) + 7 yrs + 7 yrs

Regardless of the terminal digit, each number can be seen as the sum of various combinations of sacred and preferred numbers. Hill clearly expects readers to be impressed with these results. Yet having at her disposal no fewer than eleven numbers to manipulate, the suspicion does arise that any number can be made to yield to such calculations. One may suspect, too, that any other numerical scheme would "work" as well.[34] A brief experiment will serve to confirm these suspicions.

[31]Ibid., 241.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Ibid., 245. Hill includes not only the forty pregenerative and postgenerative numbers from both genealogies, but the age-at-death figures that are supplied in Gen 5 and implied in the second genealogy.

[34]Nelson, while not analyzing Hill's scheme in detail, did nevertheless offer the observation that the formula Hill used to reproduce the age data associated with Nahor can be used (in its multiples) to reproduce any age (Nelson, "Numerology in Genesis," 70). I here offer a more extensive analysis of Hill's sexagesimal scheme.

Let us, for the sake of illustration, reject the Mesopotamian connection and imagine that the biblical author employed only the biblical preferred numbers—three, seven, twelve, and forty—which, in addition, can be doubled (the number two) or multiplied by ten. Using only six numbers, this is a markedly more restrictive system than the one employed by Hill. Despite this restriction, the system of "preferred numbers only" yields the following:

Adam:	130 =	7 x 2 x 10 yrs - 12 yrs + 2 yrs (2 x 12 mos)
	800 =	70 x 12 yrs - 40 yrs
	930 =	40 x 12 x 2 yrs - 70 yrs + 40 yrs
Methuselah:	187 =	12 x 12 yrs + 40 yrs + 3 yrs
	782 =	40 x 2 x 10 yrs - 7 x 3 yrs + 3 yrs
	969 =	40 x 12 x 2 yrs + 12 yrs - 3 yrs

With results so easily possible using only the biblical preferred numbers, one might wonder why a Jew would eschew using a purely "Jewish" numerical system in favor of a mongrel Jewish-Mesopotamian system (as in Hill's scheme). If the purpose of the Genesis 5 and 11 genealogies has anything to do with presenting the line of God's people, culminating in the Jewish race, the purposeful neglect of a purely Jewish numerical system is baffling.

Regardless of this mystery, we are forced by these calculations to an important conclusion: the fact that all the numbers can be fitted into a sexagesimal system does not prove that they are the product of that system. It can be decisively shown they that can just as easily be fitted into a competing system. Crucially, not only does Hill's system not constitute proof that the biblical writer/editor employed such a scheme as Hill imagines, but it cannot even constitute evidence of schematization. For if the genealogical numbers can, at the will of the interpreter, be made to fit virtually any numerical scheme, it follows that no one of those schemes points the evidence in any one direction. If the genealogical numbers were indeed contrived as part of a numerological scheme, the evidence for that would have to be built on a basis entirely different from the one that Hill has presented. And even if evidence of a numerological scheme were to be found, and found on such a basis, one would still have to prove that the biblical writer had one particular scheme in mind and not another.

The deficiency of such a scheme can be exposed from another angle, and via a question: Is Hill suggesting that the formulas she describes were the precise formulas that the Bible writer had in mind? In truth, this cannot be known, for the simple reason that different formulas, using the same set of numbers as Hill employs, can produce the same totals. Here, again, is Hill's suggestion for 930 (Adam's age at death): 930 = 60 x 3 x 5 yrs (60 mos) + 6 x 5 yrs (60 mos). But the total of 930 can also be produced as 930 = 60 x 4 x 4 yrs - 6 x 5 yrs (60 mos) or as 930 = 60 x 10 yrs + 60 x 5 yrs (60 mos) + 6 x 5 yrs (60 mos). Clearly, then, Hill has achieved no more than to demonstrate her own mathematical abilities. Her calculations provide no insight at all into what formulas the biblical author might have had in mind—or, indeed, as to whether he had any formulas in mind at all.

That more than one formula can produce the same total suggests another questionable element in Hill's scheme—and in any other similar scheme: What do the formulas individually mean? That is, what is the meaning of, say, "60 x 3 x 5 yrs (60 mos) + 6 x 5 yrs (60 mos)" over and against "(60 + 60 + 60 + 6 + 6) x 60 mos - 5 yrs (60 mos) + 7 yrs + 7 yrs"?[35] Why might the writer have chosen these particular combinations? And if the ages are artificial, were those ages chosen before the formulas, or vice versa? Let us try to imagine the process by which the biblical writer contrived these supposedly artificial numbers.

The writer has before him a name that he wishes to include in his genealogy; let us say, Methuselah. Whatever age Methuselah really lived to—whether to his 90s or 900s—the biblical writer wishes to associate with Methuselah an age that is in harmony with Mesopotamian sacred numbers.[36] Does the writer first choose a desired age number—one that ends in a zero or a five, or which hides some other attraction—and then find a formula to match it? In that case, the formula is secondary to the age number and probably has no special meaning in itself. Or does the writer begin by choosing (or constructing) a formula with no particular age datum in mind? This is surely not the case, since beginning with a formula will result in random ages, and not in desirable ages like 777 (Lamech's age at death) or ages that end frequently with a 0 or 5 digit. Furthermore, our biblical author evidently wishes to have Methuselah dying in the year of the flood.[37] He cannot achieve that by luck, hoping his formula will, by some fluke, produce the necessary age datum. No, the ages are chosen first. And since that is the case, it is obvious that the numbers are not the product of a numerological scheme, but that a numerological scheme has been applied (by the author/redactor) to the numbers.

To insist, against this evidence, that the numbers are the result of a numerological scheme is to accept one of two very unlikely scenarios. The first is that the biblical writer constructed fine-looking formulas with no end number in view and which, when calculated, achieved the serendipitous result of a disproportionate percentage of numbers with final digits of 0 or 5, and of special numbers like 777 or 365. Furthermore, with the exception of the 365, nearly all of the formulas resulted in numbers that, in the first genealogy, hovered around the 900 or more mark, and in the second produced a near-consistent downward trend! If these numbers are artificial, their individual and combined character is to be understood as the product of teleology and not serendipity.

The second unlikely scenario is that the writer used ready-made formulas from some kind of list—a Mesopotamian numerologist's almanac, if you will. But where is the evidence of such an almanac? And why would one exist, since, in any case, multiple formulas might well exist for every number.

[35]The two formulas, taken from Hill, are, respectively, Adam's age at death and Methuselah's age at death.

[36]Recall Hill's comment cited earlier: "It was important to associate one's life with the right numbers" (Hill, "Making Sense," 242).

[37]The numbers as found in the MT produce this result. The LXX does not.

The idea that, for the Mesopotamians, "it was important to associate one's life with the right numbers,"[38] may or may not be true (Hill offers no evidence for this assertion). But such an assertion demands the concomitant understanding that not every number was "right." That means Hill's coterie of eleven numbers was certainly not the basis for these "right" numbers; it must have been a much more restrictive list, consisting perhaps of only two or three numbers of which sixty was one. Only then could there exist a select number of "right" numbers defined by sexagesimal formulas. Obviously, then, Hill's eleven-number scheme is irrelevant to the alleged reality of Mesopotamian numerology as Hill describes it. Indeed, on every practical level, her proposed scheme seems unlikely, if not impossible.

The Issue of Preferred Numbers

Preferred Numbers in Genesis

The rejection of a numerological scheme does not, however, imply the rejection of what Hill calls "preferred numbers."[39] It is uncontested that the numbers three, seven, twelve, and forty appear frequently in both Testaments, and that their use is often connected with highly significant events. The result of such usage is that these numbers are themselves invested with a special significance. While no significance need be attached to the fact that Zebulun, for example, had three sons (Gen 46:14), there is cause for reflection when we observe that Lamech lived 777 years. As if the number were not significant enough in itself, the fact that this Lamech named his son Noah, meaning "rest"[40]—recalling God's rest on the seventh day (Gen 2:3)—seems more than coincidental. To the modern reader, Enoch's total lifespan of 365 years is similarly suggestive. But it is questionable whether the number 365 held much significance for a people who, from the evidence of the Old Testament, employed a calendar based on twelve thirty-day months (360 days).[41] Nevertheless, for argument's sake, let us accept that this number also, as used in the genealogy, is special.

[38]Hill, "Making Sense," 241.

[39]Hill, "Making Sense," 243.

[40]Max Seligsohn, "Noah," *JE* 9:319.

[41]The Egyptians were certainly aware that the lunar year was approximately 365 days in length. Although their civil calendar consisted of twelve thirty-day months, the Egyptians added an extra five days at the end of each year in order to reach the required total of 365 (Anthony Spaliner, "Ancient Egyptian Calendars," in *Handbook of Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy*, ed. Clive L. N. Ruggles [New York: Springer, 2015], 1489). In respect to the Israelites, Scripture itself gives few clues as to their exact calendrical practices. Witness to thirty-day months and 360-day years is found in the apocalyptic prophecies (cf. Dan 7:25; Rev 12:6, 13; 13:5). Every few years a "second Adar" (Adar was the Babylonian name for the twelfth month) was added in order to keep the festival dates aligned with the agricultural realities ("Adar," *ISBE* 1:51). It may be reasonable to assume that the Israelites were nevertheless aware of the 365-day solar cycle as witnessed in the Egyptian civil calendar. However, given that Scripture itself knows only 360-day years, it seems odd that the writer of Genesis would have elected to append the number "365" to Enoch: why not "360"?

Mention may be made of the apparent significance of "seven" in connection with certain individuals in the Genesis genealogies. For example, a Lamech appears as seventh in the line from Adam, through Cain. More detail in the narrative is accorded him than any other in the line. Similarly, more detail is given to Enoch, seventh in the line from Adam, through Seth. In the Gen 5 genealogy, another Lamech appears, whose age at death is given as 777.[42] On one level, then, the first Lamech is parallel with Enoch, both being seventh in the line. On another level, the first Lamech parallels the second, sharing the same name. Laurence Turner observes that there is one speech recorded in each of the two genealogies (Gen 4 and Gen 5): both are given by a character named Lamech.[43] Again, in the listing of Jacob's sons upon their entry into Egypt, the seventh (Gad) has just seven sons; more than that, the numerical value of his name turns out to be exactly seven ('g' = 3 and 'd' = 4; the vowels in Hebrew have no numerical value).[44] After noting also that the total number from Jacob's family who moved to Egypt was seventy, Turner concludes: "One suspects that a list with these characteristics is providing more than simply bald genealogical data."[45]

Perhaps it is. Turner relates the recurring "sevens" of the genealogies back to the creation account of Gen 1.[46] The seventh day marked the completion of God's work of creation, by which chaos had been transformed into order. And just as God had first demonstrated his sovereignty over creation, so the patterns and orderliness of the genealogies are intended to bear witness to God's sovereignty in human history.[47] Is Turner suggesting that the names, positioning of names, and numerical data of the genealogies are to some degree contrived in order to make this theological point? Or that God so ordered the events of history that the individuals in these genealogies lived and died and spoke and were given names by his sovereign direction? Or, perhaps, that the Lord moved upon the writer of Genesis so to order the (historical?) material as to make the patterns with their theological import? Turner does not say. But if God truly is sovereign, as the genealogies are said to remind us, there need be no objection to the suggestion that there were just ten generations from Adam to Noah, that Enoch was exactly the seventh generation from Adam, and that Lamech did live 777 years.[48] This idea will be explored further, below.

[42]Laurence Turner, *Back to the Present: Encountering Genesis in the 21st Century* (Grantham, England: Autumn House, 2004), 69–70.

[43]Ibid., 75.

[44]Ibid., 71.

[45]Ibid., 72.

[46]Turner notes that the creation account of Gen 1 is stated to be *toledoth* (*genealogy*; Gen 2:4a), as is the genealogy of Gen 5 (Gen 5:1); see ibid., 68.

[47]Ibid., 73.

[48]One hesitates to include the idea, propounded by Turner, that the first Lamech (in Cain's line) was seventh from Adam. It is true: he was. But he is not presented as such in the text (as Turner acknowledges; see ibid., 69). The genealogy begins with Cain, not with Adam, making Lamech sixth in the genealogy. One can *make* Lamech

Attention has also been drawn to the ages associated with Noah and his son Shem. Noah was 500 years old when he begot "Shem, Ham, and Japheth"; Shem was one hundred years old when he begot Arphaxad, and lived a further 500 years after the birth of that son. Donald A. Huebner draws out the implication of these numbers:

> Noah . . . was 500 years old when his sons were born and the Flood followed 100 years later when he was 600. His son Shem . . . became a father when he was 100 years old and he lived 500 more years, dying at the age of 600. The chance of this being anything other than a fabricated, symbolic use of special numbers is miniscule.[49]

The numbers associated with Abraham also appear oddly deliberate: he was called out of Ur when he was seventy-five years old; had Isaac at the age of one hundred, exactly twenty-five years later; and died at the age of 175, exactly one hundred years after coming out of Ur. Did it just so happen that these events took place at these ages? Technically, Abraham's life events do not belong to the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies,[50] yet his case is interesting for precisely that reason. For whereas the numbers in the genealogies are simply given, those in Abraham's life are connected with particular events and therefore provide a means by which to assess (at least partially) the integrity of these numbers.

So it is said that Abraham had lived "ten years in the land [of Canaan]" (Gen 16:3) when his wife suggested he procure a son through her maid Hagar. Since he had departed from Haran at the age of seventy-five (Gen 12:4), he must at this time have been about eighty-five years old. And indeed he is stated to have been "eighty-six years old when Hagar bore Ishmael" (Gen 16:16). Thirteen years later, at the age of "ninety-nine" (Gen 17:1), God appears to Abraham and promises that Sarah herself will bear a son "at this set time next year" (v. 21). In the same chapter, Ishmael is circumcised. Crucially, he is stated to be "thirteen years old" (v. 25) and Abraham is again noted as being ninety-nine (v. 24). Why is there the need to repeat Abraham's age? We cannot know for certain the biblical writer's reason, but we can know with certainty the result: all the age data connected with particular events

---

parallel with Enoch (by counting from Adam), but the text itself makes no attempt to do so. Had the author of Genesis wished to make such a parallel, he would have either commenced the genealogy with Adam or introduced another name somewhere between Cain and Lamech. If, as many suppose, there were numerous missing generations in the Genesis genealogies, finding an extra name would have presented no difficulty to the author. Beginning the genealogy with Cain is, of course, significant: the line of Cain stands in contrast with the line of Adam. The latter genealogy is sometimes referred to as the "Sethite" genealogy, perhaps in order to contrast these two sons of Adam. But Hasel correctly points out that Scripture does not call it the Sethite Genealogy but "the genealogy of Adam" ("Genesis 5 and 11," 24).

[49]Donald A. Huebner, "Biblical Longevities: Some Questions and Issues," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 63.4 (2011): 288.

[50]Though, as suggested above (n. 17), the connection between the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies and the narrative material of the same book is intimate.

in Abraham's life, at least up until he is one hundred years old, cohere. Into the equation we must also factor Isaac's age at his mother's death. Sarah breathed her last at the age of 127 (Gen 23:1). Since she was ten years younger than her husband (Gen 17:17)—around ninety years old when she had Isaac—that would mean Isaac was a young man of some thirty-seven years when his mother died. In the chapter following that which records Sarah's death is the account of the procuring of a wife for Isaac. We are not told directly how much time elapsed between Sarah's death and Isaac's marriage. Subsequently, however, it is noted that Isaac was "forty years old when he took Rebekah as wife" (Gen 25:20). Again, the numbers and narrative details cohere. Thus, because of the interlocking nature of the events and numerical data, if the figures of seventy-five, ten, and one hundred for Abraham and forty for Isaac are contrived, so are all the rest, and the entire fabric of the narrative begins to unravel.

But if these numbers are not contrived, they must be real. And if they are real, the coincidences are amazing, unless it is suggested that the providential hand of God was controlling events in individual lives and that he has a seeming predilection for certain numbers. If this were the case in the lives of Abram and Isaac, it could equally be the case with Noah and Shem and others.

The Forty-year Reigns of David and Solomon

This leads us to ponder other incidents involving preferred numbers. Both David and Solomon are recorded as reigning for forty years.[51] David and Solomon, of course, are the seminal figures of the monarchy; that both should be said to reign for forty years may seem, to some minds, as just too neat. In

[51]According to one NT reference, Saul, too, reigned for forty years (Acts 13:21), though some scholars find reason to doubt the accuracy of that figure. See, for example, R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles* (Columbus, OH: Wartburg, 1944), 521; J. Bradley Chance, *Acts*, Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary, ed. Mark K. McElroy (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2007), 216–217; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1987), 104. There is but one chronological OT note regarding Saul's reign (1 Sam 13:1), though it is problematic. It is possible that the Hebrew is corrupt in this verse, although the issue is too complex to explore here. The length of Saul's reign is not stated in the OT—the only Hebrew monarch for whom that is the case. The omission is puzzling, intriguing. Perhaps it is meant to indicate the illegitimacy of his reign. Saul was the king the people wanted. As a Benjamite, he was not of the line from whom the future monarch was forecast to come (Gen 49:10). It was David who was the king of God's choosing and the one after whom the messianic dynasty is named. If the forty years Luke ascribes to Saul's reign is accepted, what must be seen as significant is the fact that this regnal period is the same for the first three kings of the Israelite monarchy, while no subsequent king reigned for the same length of time. It is not easy to know what to make of this. But it is tempting to consider it in relation to a possible typological function of the first three kings of Israel. For an engaging, popular study on the typology of Saul, David, and Solomon, see Roy Hession, *Not I, But Christ: Our Relationship With Jesus in the Story of David* (Farmington Hills, MI: Oil Lamp Books, 2010).

the case of David, the "forty" is clearly rounded, because David really "reigned over Judah seven years and six months, and in Jerusalem he reigned thirty-three years" (2 Sam 5:5; cf. v. 4). That the forty years is thus divided into two unequal periods argues for the integrity of the numerical data, particularly since one of those periods is given as "seven years and six months." Seven is a preferred number. Were the biblical writer making up the data, one would expect him to have appended the "six months" to the other period (the thirty-three years), rather than squander the opportunity to present a pure seven years. That is, he might have suggested that David "reigned over Judah seven years, and in Jerusalem he reigned thirty-three years and six months." In the later book of 1 Kings, however, the "six months" is dropped from the "seven years and six months": "The period that David reigned over Israel was forty years: seven years he reigned in Hebron, and in Jerusalem he reigned thirty-three years" (1 Kgs 2:11). Here we find two preferred numbers (forty and seven) together. Yet the fact that Scripture has already made it clear that the seven years were really seven years and six months tells us that while the number has been rounded, it has not been fabricated.

In the case of Solomon, there are no additional biblical chronological data that can corroborate a forty-year reign. But Scripture does not treat her readers as fools. Examples are provided in certain cases and not repeated for every similar case.[52] As seen here, the forty years for David is a rounded number, though very close to the actual figure. Should Solomon have reigned some thirty-nine or forty-one years, it should raise no eyebrows to find that the biblical author chose to record his reign as a round forty.[53] Typologically,

[52]One example will suffice. Near the end of his Gospel, John writes: "Truly Jesus did many other signs . . . which are not written in this book; but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name" (John 20:30–31). A similar comment would have been appropriate in each of the other three Gospels. But it was not necessary for God to inspire all four Gospel writers to make the same comment. Having it in one is sufficient; the reader is expected to apply it in other appropriate cases.

[53]While no additional *biblical* data exists that can corroborate a forty-year reign for Solomon, a remarkable confirmation appears to be available from the so-called Tyrian King List. From the chronological material in this list that is constructed entirely independent of any biblical chronological data, it is possible to establish the beginning of the construction of Solomon's temple as occurring in 968/967 BCE This would have to correlate to the fourth year of Solomon's reign (1 Kgs 6:1). If the division of the kingdom after the death of Solomon is dated to 931/930 BCE (Edwin R. Thiele's widely accepted date; see *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, 3rd ed. [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983], 78, 217), one is left with a regnal length of forty years for Solomon. I am indebted to Rodger C. Young for directing me to the relevance of the Tyrian King List to the matter of Solomon's reign. For a more in-depth discussion of the King List, see Young's "Three Verifications of Thiele's Date for the Beginning of the Divided Kingdom," *AUSS* 45:2 (2007): 163–189, especially 179–187. On the precise date of Solomon's death, see again Young, "When Did Solomon Die?" *JETS* 46:4 (2003): 589–603. Young provides detailed arguments that he claims establish Solomon's death as occurring between Nisan 931 BCE and Tishri

both David and Solomon represent Christ—the one as Christ the shepherd king (cf. Ezek 34:23–24), the other as Christ the king of glory (cf. 1 Kgs 4:21, 24–25; Matt 6:29). Why may it not be that God, in his providence, had both these kings reign for a similar period of time simply because of the typological significance of their reigns? In any case, given the care in which the lengths of the reigns of every one of the kings of Judah and Israel is recorded, it would seem odd to impute a falsified regnal length to just these two kings.

Jacob's Family of Seventy

Hill refers to the family of Jacob, seventy in number, who went down to Egypt (Gen 46:27). She claims that the number seventy "was symbolic among the Israelites for any family blessed with fertility (e.g., the seventy "sons" of Jacob who went down to Egypt …)."[54] But, again, the number "seventy" in this case does not appear to be contrived, since each of the seventy individuals is named. In fact, however, the number of sons who went with Jacob was only sixty-seven. This number includes grandsons; but, unusually, it also includes one daughter (Dinah, through Leah) and one granddaughter (Serah, through Asher). We may presume that Jacob's name brings the total to seventy, as is allowed by the text: "All the persons of the house of Jacob who went to Egypt were seventy" (Gen 46:27).

It is possible to mount the argument that the biblical writer omitted some names from Jacob's family in order to have no more than seventy as a total. But at least three considerations combine to demand the repudiation of any such suggestion. First, the careful recording of names, noting to which mother they belonged, and providing subtotals for each group, indicates that the writer is concerned to provide a thorough listing. Second, the distribution of children and grandchildren is strongly inconsistent with any schematization. For example, Benjamin is recorded as having ten sons—more (in most cases, many more) than any of his brothers. Yet Benjamin was the youngest; one might expect that his family would be the smallest, not the largest, at the time of entry into Egypt. By contrast, Dan, the fifth oldest, produced only one son. Some sons (Judah, Asher) had grandsons; others did not. If the biblical writer was adding or omitting names to achieve a particular total, it is almost unbelievable that he would have allowed Benjamin ten sons and left Dan with only one, and that he would have included two grandsons each to Judah and Asher while, again, recording only one descendant for Dan.[55] Third, it is

931 BCE, that is, the *first* half of the year beginning in Nisan 931 BCE rather than the second half as "assumed" by Thiele (Young, "When Did Solomon Die?" 591).

[54]Hill, "Making Sense," 243.

[55]There are difficulties in ascribing ten sons to Benjamin, given his young age at the time of the entry into Egypt. Various solutions have been offered in the commentaries. The genealogical listing for Benjamin in Num 26:38–40 lists only five sons and two grandsons, the grandsons having the same names as two of the sons mentioned in the Genesis list. Again, solutions have been offered, but two considerations need to be kept in mind: (1) if it be deemed unlikely that the youthful Benjamin could have had ten sons by the time of the entry into Egypt, it is even less likely that he could have

similarly to be doubted that the author would have included two women—one of whom plays no role in any narrative—in order to make the desired total, if there had been additional sons who could have been included in the list.[56]

It is therefore incumbent upon us to accept that the number of Jacob's household that went down into Egypt really was seventy, no matter how "preferred" that number might be. Similarly, however preferred the number forty might be, that would seem to be how many years David reigned. There is not space here to consider more of the many such examples where preferred numbers can be demonstrated, with reasonable certainty, to be literal. Hill herself poses an important question when she asks, "In the case of all these preferred numbers [throughout Scripture], which are to be considered literal and which figurative?"[57] There is, she admits, no way to know: "How such symbolic numbers were meant at the time of writing is something that we may only guess at today, and if a specific principle ever underlay such figurative numbers, it is no longer readily apparent."[58] This, however, does not prevent her from claiming that in many cases these preferred numbers are used symbolically or figuratively.[59] Oddly, she recognizes an alternative understanding, but seems to accord it no significance: "Unless we assume that God prefers certain numbers over other numbers, and somehow passed that preference down to the Hebrews, we must acknowledge that in many

been a grandfather by that same time. There is therefore merit in the suggestion of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (SDABC) that the two grandsons listed in Num 26:40 were not identical to the sons of Benjamin (Gen 46:21) but were so named by their father in memory of two brothers who had died; see on Gen 46:21, F. D. Nichol, ed., SDABC, 7 vols. (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1978), 1:469; (2) regardless of the solutions that have been offered in the various commentaries, the point being made here is unaffected, since the fact remains that the writer of Genesis lists ten sons for Benjamin: he would hardly have fabricated such an obvious difficulty. It may just be that Benjamin was more precocious or more fecund than his brothers (cf. 1 Chr 4:27).

[56]The inclusion of Dinah can be accounted for on the basis that, following her aborted marriage to Shechem, she remained single. The SDABC suggests that she therefore was counted as an independent unit (Nichol, SDABC, 1:469). This may be so. But *justification* for her inclusion does not imply the *necessity* of her inclusion. Had another son been available, would not the author have included his, rather than the woman's, name in order to reach the desired total? This argument would seem to lose its force if it were the case that there were several more sons over and above the seventy. For if several sons were already omitted from the list (in order to keep it at seventy), one more omission to make way for Dinah would hardly matter. But this objection is itself susceptible of criticism. First, on what basis would some sons, and not others, be considered 'extra'? Second, the 'extras' would almost certainly have had to be grandsons, not sons. For it is almost unthinkable that the biblical writer would have included two grandsons (to Judah and Asher) among the seventy while omitting sons. Third, why do no subsequent genealogical lists give any hint of those extra sons?

[57]Hill, "Making Sense," 243.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid.

cases where preferred numbers are used in the Bible, they are to be taken symbolically or figuratively."[60] But the option that Hill so easily skipped over deserves consideration.

God and Preferred Numbers

We may begin by considering more carefully the first clauses of Hill's aforementioned statement: "Unless we assume that God prefers certain numbers over other numbers, and somehow passed that preference down to the Hebrews . . . ."[61]

That the author recognizes this as a possible option, but chooses to bypass it completely without offering any justification for doing so, may be taken to mean that she considers it of no relevance or value to the discussion. Why? Her statement here falls only a little short of ridicule—as though we cannot possibly entertain the idea that God would use particular numbers in a particular way. Yet every time the historical veracity of the numbers in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies is questioned on the basis that some of those numbers are preferred numbers, there is an implicit denial that God would carry out his purposes within the restrictions of human numerical systems. In this, Hill is hardly alone.

But if the concept of providence is to be accepted at all, it would seem unnecessary to argue that it be allowed to embrace matters of time and timing. For timing is an integral aspect of providence; it is hard to imagine a providential act that does not occur at the very moment God ordains it to occur. What does God ever do that is not timed to perfection? This is a crucial observation, for time and timing often involve numbers. Thus, in the providence of the Almighty, the Son of God was born "in the fullness of the time" (Gal 4:4). That time was foreordained and foretold in a prophecy that was based upon numbers (Dan 9:24–25). Furthermore those numbers were not random or haphazard: the prophecy was based upon multiples of "seven"—a preferred number. Whether or not God passed down to the Hebrews his preference for the number seven—the option that Hill evidently finds so unappealing—or that God made use of human systems of numbering is, at this point, unimportant. The question to be considered is: Does Scripture provide evidence that might indicate God's purposeful use of preferred numbers? Such evidence will now be considered.

God's Providence in the Numbers

Abraham and Joseph

As already noted here, there is good reason to believe that the chronological data recorded for various events in Abraham's life should be accepted at face value. It is necessary to reinforce the point made earlier: if we reject any of those chronological items on the basis that they happen to be preferred

[60]Ibid.

[61]Ibid.

numbers, the collateral damage to much of the narrative connected with Abraham is considerable. The interconnection of the narrative details and the chronological items is sufficient to support the claim that they stand or fall together. For example, if Abraham was sevent-five years old when he left Haran, dwelt in Canaan for ten years before taking Hagar as a concubine, and begot Isaac one year after Ishmael was circumcised at thirteen years of age, then it is beyond question that he was around one hundred years old when the son of promise was born. It was at God's behest that Abraham left Ur and then Haran. Abraham did not choose to become an exile and a pilgrim in celebration of reaching his seventy-fifth year! The birth of Isaac was a direct miracle: it was God who chose to provide a child when Abraham reached his one hundredth year. Whatever the implications of those facts, we must simply accept the evidence that God on these occasions chose to use numbers that human beings might regard as special.

This evidence is not singular. The book of Genesis records a period of seven years of plenty followed immediately by seven years of famine in Egypt during the time of Joseph. The number "seven" is here clearly not intended to be understood as symbolic. For when Joseph eventually revealed himself to his brothers, he informed them that two years of famine had passed and five more remained (Gen 45:6). That the years of feast and famine came about by God's providence is stated specifically in the text (Gen 41:25, 28, 32). Why God in this case "preferred" periods of seven years rather than two or five or eight is not revealed. What is revealed is that this is exactly what God did do.

Pharaoh and the Exodus

One of the most direct biblical statements of God's providential hand in the life of an individual occurs in connection with the pharaoh of the Exodus. Through Moses, God declared to the Egyptian ruler: "But indeed for this purpose I have raised you up, that I may show my power in you" (Exod 9:16). It is not just that God raised up this pharaoh, but that he raised him up at that time. Again, there is mystery in this divine process; here is one place, surely, where "his ways [are] past finding out" (Rom 11:33). Yet the existence of this individual at that particular time and in that particular place, and God's self-testimony on that fact, is evidence of one way in which God manages human affairs.[62] The idea that the Lord may have caused Enoch to be born exactly seven generations after Adam, and Eber (whose name suggests "Hebrew") seven generations after Enoch, is neither impossible nor implausible. If it is accepted that the details of the Israelite cultic system were not Moses's own but communicated to him by God, then one is confronted by an astonishing divine preoccupation with the number "seven" (cf. Exod 12:15; 22:30; 25:37; 29:30; 29:37; Lev 4:6; 12:2; 13:4; 23:15, 18; 1 Kgs 7:17; Ezek 40:22; 41:3; etc.).

[62]Whether this is the case for every individual born, or whether only for selected individuals for whom God has a particular purpose at a particular time, is a question that lies beyond the focus of the present discussion.

Furthermore, the providential timing for the life of this individual (pharaoh) is mirrored in the providential timing of the wider Exodus event itself. For it was "on that very same day" (Exod 12:41) that God miraculously brought to an end a sojourn the length of which had been prophesied four centuries earlier (Gen 15:13). Clearly, the Almighty's interventions in human affairs at both the national and the individual level are not haphazard in terms of timing. As with the prophesied birth of Jesus, that timing may be revealed through numbers.

Israel's Forty Years in the Wilderness

As with the seven years of famine in the days of Joseph in Egypt, the forty years in which Israel wandered in the wilderness was a set period that God imposed upon the nation. The forty years were based on the forty days in which the spies had surveyed the land of Canaan. Although the number "forty" is significant, being a preferred number, what is more significant, for the moment, is that God then used that same number in his judgment upon the nation. That, in itself, does not prove that God was seizing the opportunity to make use of a preferred number; had the spies done their work for, say, twenty or thirty-three days, their years of punishment would, presumably, have matched the days of spying out the land. But it does, at a minimum, indicate that God's interactions with humanity include engaging with them at a numerical level. Whether the spies took forty days by God's leading, whether they purposely chose that period of time conscious of the significance of the number, or whether they just so happened to conclude their business in exactly forty days does not matter: the point is that God entered into the Israelites' world of numbers.

We may recall also the "forty days and forty nights" that "the rain was on the earth" in the days of Noah (Gen 7:12). In this case, the forty days and nights are part of a careful chronology: the rain began "in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month" (v. 11); it "prevailed on the earth one hundred and fifty days" (v. 24); this period finished "in the seventh month, the seventeenth day of the month" (8:4); and "in the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, the earth was dried" (8:14). These periods are also linked with the chronology of Noah's life: the rain began "in the six hundredth year of Noah's life" (7:11) and the drying up of the earth was accomplished "in the six hundred and first year" (8:13). Besides the number "forty," the only other numbers upon which there could be any suspicion of artificiality in this account are "seventh," "one hundred and fifty" and "six hundred." But if these numbers are artificial, what is their meaning in connection with the event? Why were they selected rather than others? For example, why were forty days selected and not seventy? And why did the biblical author not bother to use special numbers for the other events in this chronicle—the "second month," the "seventeenth day," and the "twenty-seventh day"? Indeed, if no special meaning vis-à-vis the events can be attached to all or most of the numbers, why would the author bother to provide such a detailed chronicle at all, unless it was to provide a faithful chronicle of an

important event? And if in so doing he chose to use some special numbers, why did he also use nonspecial numbers? Does not the admixture of both special and non-special numbers argue for the integrity of them all?

The number "forty" is, of course, significant also in the NT. Each of the synoptic Gospels records that Jesus was forty days in the wilderness. This does not seem to have been a case of the gospel writers conspiring to use a preferred number. It is an impressive fact that each of the three OT texts that Jesus cited against Satan were drawn from the Pentateuchal narratives connected with Israel's forty years in the wilderness.[63] Must we entertain the idea that Jesus' selection of these particular texts was random, that by some happy felicity they all derive from the same period of Israel's history—a period, moreover, whose length in years precisely equals the length in days of Jesus' wilderness experience? It is not even necessary to know whether or not Jesus himself purposely chose to remain in the desert for this period of time. He entered the desert driven by the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:12); quite likely the conclusion of his wilderness experience came also at the behest of the Spirit of God. It is therefore consistent to demand at least the possibility that this same Spirit inspired other special time periods in the Bible.

On this point, indeed, we may consider the use of the number seventy in the prophecies of both Jeremiah and Daniel. The prophet Jeremiah announced to his countrymen that the Babylonians would dominate their neighbors for "seventy years" (Jer 25:11–12; 29:10).[64] The prophet Daniel is subsequently

[63]Hans K. LaRondelle writes, "In his deliberate fasting for exactly forty days, Jesus reenacted the experience of Israel, but manifested ultimate obedience to God by His appeal to the revealed word of God to Israel. . . . The remarkable fact is that Christ, as His answer to the three temptations, each time quoted a passage from the book of Deuteronomy, chapters six through eight, when other passages were available." On this point, LaRondelle cites Robert T. France, who suggests that Christ perhaps saw in these chapters a pattern for his own time of testing. See LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983), 64–65.

[64]The actual period of Judah's captivity in Babylon was slightly less than that (605 BCE to 538 BCE), whether because a merciful God cut the days short (cf. Matt 24:22) or because "*approximately* seventy years" may legitimately be stated as "seventy years." On the other hand, it may be that the return from exile occurred somewhat later than 538 BCE. To begin with, one recent study has dated the first full year of Cyrus as 537/536 BCE (Steven Anderson, "Darius the Mede: A Reappraisal," [PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2014]). Furthermore, Andrew E. Steinmann has pointed out that, while permission for the exiles to return to Palestine was granted in Cyrus's first year, it would have taken some months or even years to sell property and make other necessary arrangements for the return; see "A Chronological Note: The Return of the Exiles under Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel (Ezra 1–2)," *JETS* 51.3 (2008): 521–522. Steinmann further argues that the Jews would have reentered their land in a sabbatical year, which can be calculated with certainty as 533 BCE (ibid., 521). If Steinmann is correct in his proposal that the exiles returned in 533 BCE (and in this author's opinion, his arguments on this precise point are not strong), it clearly does not help in confirming an exact seventy-year period of captivity. Nevertheless, his suggestion that time would have been required to make the necessary

given a prophecy that builds on Jeremiah's "seventy" (Dan 9:2, 24–27). The fact that Daniel's thoughts had turned toward the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy at about the time the seventy years were drawing to a close, shows that he certainly did not regard the "seventy" as anything other than literal (Dan 9:2). Daniel's "seventy weeks" is, significantly, divided into periods: seven "sevens," sixty-two "sevens," and one "seven" (Dan 9:25–27). If we accept at face value the claims of both Jeremiah and Daniel, and the testimony of 2 Pet 1:20, these prophecies came not by the will of the prophets but by the will of the Holy Spirit. The use of this preferred number—seven, and its multiples—was, therefore, ordered by God.

The preceding are just a sampling of the many examples that Scripture provides of the way in which God himself has been pleased to employ "preferred" numbers. Since this phenomenon may be firmly established—provided one accepts a supernatural inspiration of Scripture—we cannot discount the possibility that special numbers such as 777, 365, 75, 100, 500, 600, and any others found in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies, might be real numbers, reflecting the actual lengths of events and lives, obtained through the providence of God. That is, Lamech did actually live for 777 years, and did so by the special providence and purpose of God. Again, God himself ordained that Abraham should be one hundred years old at the birth of Isaac.

An Orderly God

It would be unfortunately anthropocentric to claim that the love of order, balance, and symmetry are intrinsically human concerns. Do they not rather derive from the One who has made us in his own image?[65] If we admit the direct hand of God in the creation of living creatures, we are drawn to the conclusion that God is a lover of symmetry and balance. The number and arrangement of eyes and ears, mouth and nose, limbs and digits, are in no cases haphazard. And if human beings have been inclined to favor numbers such as two, four, five, and ten, they have likely done so because these are numbers that they see repeatedly in the world of nature and living creatures. One would not need to look far: each of these numbers is evident in the human body. By contrast, the extensive, and early, use of the number seven in Scripture must have a different explanation. The prior existence of the Sabbath still seems to be the best, perhaps the only, reasonable explanation for the fixation upon a number for which there is no obvious example in nature.[66]

arrangements to leave Babylon and Anderson's chronological revision of Cyrus's first year are, in combination, helpful. A preparation time of just one or two years (instead of the five that Steinmann defends) following 537/536 BCE would produce a return date that more closely fulfills the seventy-year prophecy. I am indebted again to Robert C. Young for directing my attention to Anderson's and Steinmann's two articles.

[65]Thus the Corinthian church members are admonished to do all things "decently and in order" because "God is not the author of confusion but of peace" (1 Cor 14:40, 33).

[66]It is obviously insufficient to suggest that the biblical authors used the number "seven" because of a practice (Sabbath-keeping) that was already firmly established in their culture. That is no doubt true, but the question must be: Why was a *seventh*-day

The origins of the decimal system may not be known with certainty, but it would not be irresponsible to postulate that having ten fingers and toes had something to do with it. With the power of ten, of course, numbers such as four and seven become forty and seventy, numbers that are well attested in Scripture. Again, the number one hundred, along with its fourfold division into twenty-five, fifty, and seventy-five, may be easily accounted for. With this in mind, we must question any tendency to be surprised at the suggestion that the Creator might have worked with such numbers in both his providential "girding" of men's lives and his girding of men's minds in the production of the sacred record. The numbers themselves arise from the Lord's creativity. It is not to be wondered at that he frequently employed them in his providential activity in salvation history.

Summary

A good deal of ground has been covered in this discussion. The major points now need to be reviewed. It is true that both schematization and patterns are to be found in the pages of Scripture. While schematization may often include the use of patterns, the latter is not necessarily indicative of the former, since patterns can exist naturally.

There are definite patterns and parallels in the number of generations in the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies. Yet it is not a simple ten-ten pattern. Instead, there is a complex three-fold system of parallels so constituted that it argues against schematization of the data.

At first glance the age data associated with each generation of the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies appear to be artificial. Yet proving that to be the case is not a simple task. Makous has shown through a series of statistical analyses that the numbers do not demonstrate the usual characteristics of artificial numbers. Furthermore, it seems likely that some of the numbers have been rounded. But while rounding means the numbers are, strictly speaking, no longer random, rounding numbers does not make them artificial.

If the numbers are artificial, it is likely they have been concocted as part of a scheme. But what is the scheme? Hill is one who has tried to show that the biblical writer has employed a numerological scheme. Yet it has been shown here that such a scheme fails on logical and practical grounds. Hill has produced no solid evidence that would mandate preferring her numerological scheme above another. The fact that any particular number can be expressed by a variety of formulas is the first stroke of the death knell of such numerological schemes. That the age data of Gen 5 and 11, especially when taken together, cannot have been the product of numerological formulas means that the application of formulas is nothing more than an exercise in interpretive imagination.

While only one numerological scheme was closely analyzed here, the principles adduced from that analysis can, with appropriate caution, be

---

Sabbath instituted in the first place? If the fondness for the number produced the practice of Sabbath-keeping, what explanation can be given for the choice falling upon a number which has so little importance in nature?

generalized. First, that a scheme can be applied to an existing set of numbers does not prove that such a scheme produced those same numbers. Second, with minimal imagination and experiment, almost any number can be expressed formulaically using a small group of predetermined numbers. Third, it is not at all apparent what purpose any particular numerological scheme might originally have had, much less what significance ought to be attached to any of its individual formulas. Fourth, it is not apparent why one particular scheme's supposed purpose should be preferred over another's. Post hoc patternization proves nothing, unless the suggested scheme can establish its validity exclusive of competing schemes. Fifth, the greater the number of suggested schemes, more than one of which cannot be true at the same time, the greater the skepticism that naturally appends to each. Sixth, suggested schemes are not subordinated to normal exegetical practice; on the contrary, the meaning of the text is supposed to derive, at least in part, from the scheme. Seventh, there is no direct evidence that the Genesis genealogies were constructed on the basis of any scheme; there is therefore nothing in any such scheme that can legitimately commend itself to the exegete, nor to the historian, nor to the theologian.

The use of striking-looking numbers and preferred numbers in the genealogies and beyond is acknowledged. Yet there are not a few cases in the biblical record where the context in which preferred numbers are used makes it possible to determine, with reasonable likelihood, that the preferred numbers are real numbers. Some such cases suggest the possibility that God himself chose to direct events according to a timetable that followed preferred, rather than random, numbers.

Further evidence that God has frequently accommodated himself to Israel's supposed love of preferred numbers may be found in certain prophetic messages, which were sometimes given based on such numbers. Furthermore, the origin of preferred numbers seems to lie in structures that God himself has placed in living things rather than lying in the arbitrary choice of human beings. The significance of the number "seven," too, in its connection with the Sabbath, finds its origin in the arbitrary will of God. The numbers four, five, seven, and ten, and their multiples, should therefore be recognized as God's preferred numbers—placed by him in nature or imposed (in the case of the Sabbath) upon human society. It should occasion no surprise that he would use them at significant moments in salvation history and in the record of that history.

In conclusion, none of the usual claims for schematization of names and numbers in the genealogies of Gen 5 and 11 survives close scrutiny. On the contrary, the apparent nonrandomness and special features that are observed in the genealogical data are found to have reasonable biblical explanations. It does not seem right to reject reasonable explanations drawn from solid biblical principles and examples in favor of imposed systems of schematization for which there is so little biblical support. Consequently, sound judgment suggests the numerical data of the Gen 5 and 11 genealogies be accepted for what they purport to be: real numbers pertaining to real events and real people.

Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 54, No. 2, 237–258.

DECODING ANCIENT WALDENSIAN NAMES: NEW DISCOVERIES

P. Gerard Damsteegt
Andrews University

The ancient Waldenses were members of a reformation movement, which existed in various parts of Europe, especially in the Alpine regions of Italy, France, and Spain during the high Middle Ages. Considered forerunners of the Protestant Reformation by various historians,[1] the Waldenses stressed the importance of strict adherence to the teachings of the Bible. Observing that many teachings and practices of the Roman Church were more based on tradition than on the Bible, they rejected several Catholic doctrines and traditions.

After investigating their teachings at the Third Lateran Council (1179), the Church denied Waldenses permission to preach. In addition, the Council of Verona (1184) included the Waldenses among the heretical movements of that time.[2] This condemnation was repeated in subsequent councils and brought severe persecution, which caused them to flee to more hospitable regions, resulting in a further dissemination of their teachings to other parts of Europe, such as England, Germany, Austria, Poland, and Bohemia. Waldenses, referred to by many as the "Poor of Lyon,"[3] differed from other reform-minded groups arising during the Middle Ages, in that they did not disappear or become absorbed into other movements, but continued their unique presence until today.

Statement of Problem

From the end of the twelfth century, opponents of the Waldenses called them *insabbatati*, *insabbatatis*, *xabatati*, *xabatenses*, *sabbatati*, *sabatatos*, *inzabattati*, *insabbatatorum*, and *insabbatatos*.[4] These words can be traced back to the basic

[1]Earle E. Cairns, *Christianity Through the Centuries: A History of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 221; Prescot Stephens, *The Waldensian Story: A Study in Faith, Intolerance and Survival* (Lewes, Sussex: The Book Guild, 1998), xvii–xviii; Gabriel Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent: Persecution and Survival, c. 1170–c. 1570* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 2; Peter Biller, *The Waldenses, 1170–1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002), 191.

[2]Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent*, 15–17.

[3]The 1220 edict of Emperor Fredrick II against heretics listed the Waldenses and Poor of Lyon as two separate groups (Frederici II. *Imperatoris Augusti Constitutio III. Contra Haereticos*, in Melchior Goldastus, *Collectio Constitutionum Imperialium*, 4 vols. [Frankfurt am Main: Junius, 1713; repr., Amsterdam: Sciential Verlag, 1974], 4:78). Other primary sources used "Poor of Lyon" and "Waldenses" interchangeably.

[4]*Insabbatati*, *insabbatatis* in Jacob Gretser, "Prolegomena," in *Lucae Tudensis Episcopi Scriptores alliquot succedanei contra sectam Waldensium*, ed. Jacob Gretser

forms of *insabbatati* and *sabbatati*, because of Latin declensions.[5] During subsequent centuries, historians have used these names to characterize features of the Waldensian lifestyle.

The first time the word *insabbatati* appeared in the existing Latin literature is in an edict issued in 1192 against heretics by Alfonso II, King of Aragon, (1152–1196), Count of Barcelona, and Count of Provence. This edict warned against the *Valdenses* (Waldenses) and identified them as *Insabbatatos* and *Pauperes de Lugduno* (Poor of Lyon).[6] The edict, however, did not explain why Waldenses were called *Insabbatatos*. The next use of this term was in an 1197 edict issued by the son of Alfonso II, Peter II, King of Aragon, (1174–1213) and Count of Provence. This document called them *Sabatati* and *Pauperes de Lugduno*.[7] The edict also gave no explanation of *Sabatati* or why the prefix *in-* was omitted.

Throughout the centuries, two major views have been advocated as to the meaning of these names. One view interpreted these names as a characterization of the Waldensian attire, describing them as a people wearing

(Ingolstadt: Andreas Angermarius, 1613), 14; *Insabbatati*, *insabbatatis*, *sabbatati*, and *insabbatatorum* in idem, "Praeloquia," in *Trias scriptorum adversus Waldensium sectam, Ebrardus Bethunienis, Bernardus Abbas Fontis Calidi, Ermengardus*, ed. Gretser (Ingolstadt: Elisabeth Angermarius 1614), 7–9; *xabatati* and *xabatenses* in Ebrardus Bethuniensis, *Antihaeresis liber*, 178, in Giovanni Gonnet, *Enchiridion fontium Valdensium: Recueil critique de sources concernant les Vaudois au moyen âge du IIIe concile de Lateran au synode de Chanforan (1179–1532)* (Torre Pellice, Italy: Claudiana, 1958), 144; *sabatati* in King Peter II of Aragon, "Edictum contra haereticos," (1197), and in Gonnet, *Enchiridion fontium Valdensium*, 92; *sabatatos* in Constitutionibus Catalaniae MSS (thirteenth century), and in Charles du Fresne du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, 6 vols. (Paris: Oliva Caroli Osmont, 1735; 1st ed., Paris: Ludovicum Billaine, 1678), 4:718; *sabatatos* in *Concilio Tarraconensi* (1242), and in Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 4:718; *insabbatatorum* in Bernard Gui, *Manuel de l'lnquisiteur* (Paris: Société d'edition les belles lettres, 1964), 36, 38; *insabbatatos* in King Alphonse II of Aragon, "Edictum contra haereticos," (1192), and in Gonnet, *Enchiridion fontium Valdensium*, 92. Jean C. Zukowski and Dojcin Zivadinovic have been very helpful in locating rare primary sources.

[5]All these words are in the plural and have the same root. In the earliest Latin sources these words were spelled *insabbatati* and *sabbatati*. In later sources these words often appear as *insabatati* and *sabatati*. These differences could mean an accepted difference in spelling, but the meaning of the word remains the same.

[6]Alfonso II of Aragon, "Edictum contra haereticos," in Gonnet, *Enchiridion fontium Valdensium*, 92. Gonnet dated this edict in 1192 and its confirmation by the Council of Lerida under Pope Celestine III in 1194 (ibid., 91, 93). This Latin edict seems to pertain to the areas of Aragon as well as Provence. A 1194 version of the edict has *sabatatos* (Cebrià Beraut, "Els inicis de la inquisició a Catalunya. . . ." in Adam L. Hoose, "The *Sabatati*: The Significance of Early Waldensian Shoes, c. 1184–c. 1300," *Speculum*, 91.2 [April 2016]: 356).

[7]Peter II of Aragon, "Edictum contra haereticos," in Gonnet, *Enchiridion fontium Valdensium*, 94. This edict was a republication of the 1192 edict with some modifications and additions. Gonnet placed its confirmation by the Council of Gerona in the same year.

a peculiar type of shoes. The other view held that these names characterized the Waldensian faith, pointing out that they rejected all festivals and holy days, called sabbaths, instituted by the Catholic Church.[8]

These two conflicting views have led to confusion about the original meaning of these words, and, consequently, misconceptions about the role of the Waldenses in the history of Christianity. Until now, there has been no in-depth analysis of the use of these Latin words referring to the Waldenses in medieval literature. This paper attempts to fill this void and intends to decipher the original Latin meaning of these words and evaluate the historical evidence of these two major interpretations. First, the paper investigates the belief that *insabbatati* and *sabatati* signify the unique shoes of the Waldenses, next it looks into the view that these words express the Waldensian rejection of Roman Catholic holy days or festivals, popularly called sabbaths, and finally it evaluates the arguments for both views.

The Shoe Theory

This section will discuss the earliest footwear of the Waldenses, the origin of the introduction of unique footwear among the Poor of Lyon, and the confusion that resulted when the clergy failed to see any difference between the Roman Catholic orders of the Poor Catholics and the Reconciled Poor. It was this confusion that led to the view that the Waldenses were the ones that were wearing the unique footwear.

[8]A lesser-known view was mentioned by Jean Léger, who reported that some had contrived the meaning of *insabbatati* so as to accuse Waldenses of sorcery because of gathering on "witch-Sabbaths" with witches (see Léger, *Histoire generale des eglises evangeliques des vallees de Piemont ou Vaudoises*, 2 vols. [Leiden: Jean Le Carpentier, 1669], 2:329). Some Waldenses cited sources about priests, monks, and even certain popes who were involved in the practice of sorcery (Jean Perrin, *History of the Ancient Christians Inhabiting the Valleys of the Alps: History of the Old Waldenses Anterior to the Reformation* [Philadelphia, PA: Griffith & Simon, 1847], 26, 31–34). Pierre-François Fournier linked the word Sabbath, the Jewish day of rest, with the word *ensabates* (French for *insabbatati*), speculating that there could have existed a connection between the Waldensian heresy and sorcery meetings in the thirteenth century related to the word *insabbatati* with a root meaning connected with the seventh day of the week, the Jewish Sabbath (Pierre-François Fournier, "Etymologie de Sabbat 'reunion rituelle de sorciers,'" in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* [Paris: Librairie Droz, 1981], CXXXIX, 247–249). However, presently there are no thirteenth century primary sources to support this hypothesis. In fact, the earliest mentions of the witches' "Sabbath" appears in the middle of the fifteenth century, which is centuries later than the documents of Spanish kings identifying the Poor of Lyon as *Insabbatati*. Ginzburg extensively investigated the folkloric meaning of the witches' Sabbath from the analysis of inquisitorial witchcraft trials. He asserts that the term "witches' Sabbath" does not occur before the fifteenth century (Carlos Ginzburg, *Ecstasies Deciphering the Witches' Sabbath*, trans. by Raymond Rosenthal [New York: Pantheon, 1991], 257). Jeffrey Russell's research showed that the term *sabbat* in connection to witchcraft appears "only twice in the fifteenth century literature" (*Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1972], 237–238).

Earliest Waldensian Footwear

One of the first eyewitness accounts about Waldensian footwear came from Walter Map during the second half of the twelfth century.[9] Map was an English clergyman who, while attending the Third Lateran Council under Pope Alexander III in 1179 in Rome, was requested to investigate two Waldensian leaders.[10] He wrote in his *De Nugis Curialium* that they were dressed very plainly and did not wear shoes. He said, "They go about two and two, barefoot (*nudi pedes*, with naked feet), clad in woollen, owning nothing, but having everything in common." Map interpreted this lifestyle to indicate that the Waldenses wanted to imitate Christ and his apostles, stating, "like the apostles, nakedly following the naked Christ."[11]

Poor Catholics and Perforated Shoes

Three decades later, a unique shoe style was introduced. In Pamiers, France, in 1207, there was a discussion between the bishops Diego of Osma and Dominic of Guzmán and some of the Poor of Lyon.[12] As a result of this encounter, a group of the Poor of Lyon, under leadership of Durand of Huesca, reconciled with the Roman Catholic Church.[13] At the encouragement of some clergy, including Pope Innocent III, the followers of Durand adopted as their mission to persuade the Poor of Lyon to return to the Roman Catholic faith. In the same year, Innocent III addressed these missionaries as *pauperes catholici* (Poor Catholics).[14] This designation seemed to be an appropriate name because they preserved much of the simple lifestyle of the Poor of Lyon. The following year, this group became an official religious order of the Roman Catholic Church.

Primary sources indicate that Durand introduced the wearing of a unique type of shoes among the Poor Catholics. In 1208, in a letter to the Archbishop of Tarragon (Kingdom of Aragon), Innocent III quoted Durand, who explained the unique dress of the Poor Catholics as follows: "We have elected to wear the modest religious garb to which we are accustomed, the shoes being cut away at the top and are shaped in a special and distinct style, so that we will openly and clearly be recognized as separated in body as in

[9]See Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium: Courtiers' Trifles*, ed. and trans. M. R. James, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983; repr., 2002), xxxviii, 127. The majority of Map's writings can be dated to 1181–1182.

[10]Ibid., 126–127.

[11]Ibid. See also Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), 204.

[12]Guillaume De Puy-Laurens, "Chronique De Guillaume De Puylaurens," (1276) in *Collection des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France, depuis la fondation de la monarchie Française jusqu'au 13e siècle; avec une introduction, des supplémens, des notices et des notes*, ed. M. Guizot (Paris: J. L. Brière, 1824), 222–226; J. B. Pierron, "Poor Catholics," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 12:249.

[13]Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 715.

[14]Innocent III, *PP. Regestorum Lib.* 11.197 (PL 215:1514). This letter was sent to Durand of Huesca and his brethren who are called Poor Catholics in 1208.

heart from the Poor of Lyon, from now and forever more, unless they become reconciled to Catholic unity."[15]

In spite of Durand's efforts, the local authorities struggled in differentiating between the Poor Catholics and the Poor of Lyon. The Archbishop of Narbonne and the bishops of Béziers, Uzès, Nîmes, and Carcassonne, complained to Innocent, reporting that the Poor Catholics "have in no way at all changed the garb denoting that superstition [the Poor of Lyon] which formerly caused scandal among Catholics."[16]

It seems that, for the purposes of assimilations with the Poor of Lyon, the disciples of Durand clothed themselves with garments that closely resembled the travelling preachers of Waldo, with the only exception of perforated shoes. For Durand and his followers, the shoes cut in the upper part were supposed to serve as a sign that would hint to the clergy the true identity of the Poor Catholic preachers. However, at that time the concern among the Roman Catholic clergy about these shoes was also due to the fact that the shape of the clergy's shoes had symbolic significance and was directly related to the religious status among the various orders. For this reason, the type of footwear of the Poor Catholics brought an additional concern for the clergy.[17]

In his response to the criticism of the bishops, Innocent III wrote Durand, "And because the kingdom of God is not in outer garb but within, take care to still the scandal which grows more serious because of the former garb which you still keep. Alter this habit as you promised us to do, changing it in such a way that you show yourselves also set apart from heretics in outer raiment as you are within." [18]

Besides asking Durand to change his garments, Innocent III further admonished Durand and his followers by saying the following:

> Being unwilling to destroy the work of God for the sake of footwear. . . .
> Because woe to that man, through which the scandal comes. And therefore,

[15]"Religiosum et modestum habitum ferre decrevimus, qualem consuevimus deportare, calceamentis desuper apertis ita speciali signocompositis et variatis ut aperte et lucido cognoseamur nos esse, sicut corde, sic et corpore, a Lugdunensis et nunc et in perpetuum segregatos, nisi reconcilientur catholicae unitati" (ibid., 11.196 [PL 215:1513]). This letter was sent to the Archbishop and suffragans of the church of Tarragona in 1208. Here I quoted the translation of Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 226. The Latin original, however, reads "Lyonists," not Poor of Lyon.

[16]Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 227; "habitum etiam pristinae superstitionis scandalum apud Catholicos generantem in nullo vos penitus immutasse testantur" (Innocent III, *PP. Regestorum Lib.* 12.69 [PL 216:75]). This letter was sent to Durand of Huesca and his brethren, who were reconciled to ecclesiastical unity in 1209.

[17]Hoose, "The *Sabatati*," 357.

[18]Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 227; "Cumque non sit in exteriori habitu sed in interiori potius regnum Dei, scandalum quod de pristino habitu adhue a vobis retento fortius ingravescit, sedare curatis, ipsum habitum, prout nobis estis polliciti taliter variando ut sicut interiori habitu, sic etiam exteriori vos ab haereticis ostendatis esse divisos." (Innocent III, *PP. Regestorum Lib.* 12.69 [PL 216:76]). This letter was sent to Durand of Huesca and his brethren in 1209.

> we admonish, we advise, we exhort those of you who have not yet adopted this fashion or those who shall be associated with you in the future not to bind themselves to the custom of wearing sandals open at the top nor to wear such footgear, so that this scandal may entirely disappear.[19]

At the same time in northern Italy, Bernard Prim, one of Durand's disciples, led a group of Poor Lombards, who had broken away from the Poor of Lyon, back into the Roman Catholic Church.[20] This group, who became known as the *Pauperes reconciliati* (Reconciled Poor),[21] followed the example of Durand and the Poor Catholics, and adopted the practice of cutting the upper parts of their shoes.[22] However, it seems that Prim's followers soon gave up this practice. In a letter to Pope Innocent III, written in 1213, Prim attests, "We have elected by vote to wear the religious and modest garb to which we are accustomed to wear, using common shoes from now on, at the advice and mandate of Pontifical authority, removing the scandal which was brought against us concerning the shoes with the open tops, which we were in the habit of wearing until now."[23]

From these primary sources we can conclude the following: (1) Durand prescribed for his order a modest religious garment with perforated shoes;

[19]Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 227–28; "nolentes propter calceamenta destruere opus Dei. . . . Nam vae homini illi per quem scandalum venit. Ideoque monemus, consulimus et hortamur ut ii qui de vobis nondum signum hujusmodi acceperunt, vei qui vobis fuerint associandi de caetero, non se astringant proposito utendi scandalis desuper perforates, neque talibus calceamentis utantur, ut sic scandalum penitus evanescat" (Innocent III, *PP. Regestorum Lib.* 12.69 [PL 216:76]).

[20]Idem, *PP. Regestorum Lib.* 13.94 (PL 216:289–292). This letter was sent to all Archbishops and Bishops in 1210 bearing the title, "De negotio Valdensium conversorum." Idem, *PP. Regestorum Lib.* 14.146 (PL 216:668). This letter was sent to the Bishop of Cremona bearing the title, "De Negotio Bernardi Primi et Sociorum." See also Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 221.

[21]The name *Pauperes reconciliati* ("Reconciled Poor") appears in the writings of Peter Martyr, c. 1250. See Thomas Kaeppeli, "Une somme contre les hérétiques de Saint-Pierre Martyr?" in *Archivum Fratrum Predicatorum* 17 (1947): 334.

[22]Burchard, an abbot from Ursberg in Germany, writing around the year 1215, also confirms that a group of Poor of Lyon under the leadership of a "certain Behrnard" returned to the Catholic Church and was engaged in the practice of cutting away the top of their shoes (calceos). Burchard also attested that the Pope requested from Bernard the change of complete attire, including perforated shoes. Burchard of Ursberg, "Chronicon," in *Scriptores Rerum Germanicorum* (Hannover: Hahn, 1916), 107–108; see also Matthias Becher, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Welfen und die Chronik Burchards von Ursberg*, vol. 18b of Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007), 282.

[23]"Religiosum et modestum habitum ferre decrevimus, qualem ex voto consuevimus deportate, utendo de caetero calceamentis communibus, ad consilium et mandatum summi pontificis, pro tollendo scandalo quod contra nos movebatur de calceamentis de super apertis, quibus uti hactenus solebamus" (Innocent III, *PP. Regestorum Lib.* 15.137 [PL 216:649]). This letter was sent to Bernard Prim and his brethren in 1212.

(2) the Pope urged Durand and his followers to change their clothes altogether, as to cease resembling so much the Poor of Lyon; (3) the Pope finally ordered Durand to quit binding himself to the "scandal of wearing perforated shoes" and to assume a catholic look, and (4) Durand, and more particularly his convert Bernard Prim, yielded to the papal request, terminating the practice of wearing perforated shoes altogether. Although the leaders of these orders stopped wearing these unique shoes, their followers may have continued this practice for some time.

The efforts by Durand and his followers to create different footwear from those worn by the Poor of Lyon imply that not all Waldenses went barefoot, as were the two disciples that appeared in Rome in 1179.[24] In fact, other primary sources confirm that Waldenses wore normal shoes or sandals. Peter, a monk of the Cistercian abbey of Vaux-de-Cernay in northern France, writing between 1213–1218, mentioned that one of the errors of the "Waldenses" was that, in his opinion, they wanted to look like the apostles, stating that they were in the habit of "wearing sandals in the manner of the apostles."[25]

Finally, an important observation is that the issue of perforated shoes originated with the conversion of Durand to Catholicism in Pamiers in 1207/1208, while the labels *Insabbatati* and *sabatati* appeared in the Kingdom of Aragon many years earlier before the appearance of Durand and his group.

Confusing the Poor of Lyon with the Poor Catholics and Reconciled Poor

A close reading of the primary sources demonstrates that there is no evidence that the Poor of Lyon wore perforated shoes at the beginning of the twelfth century. Instead, this practice was introduced by the Poor Catholics and followed by the Reconciled Poor; both of them became reconciled to the Catholic faith. Due to their similarity to the Poor of Lyon, the clergy often placed Poor Catholics and Poor of Lyon in the same category. As a result, the wearing of perforated shoes became associated with the Poor of Lyon and the entire body of the Waldenses.[26] At the same time that the Poor Catholics and

[24]If Walter Map's description of the Waldensian leaders going around barefoot is representative of all Waldenses, then the wearing of shoes would distinguish the Poor Catholics from the Poor of Lyon, and there would be no need for "cutting the top" of the shoes.

[25]"in portandis sandaliis more apostolorum," Petrus Sarnesis, *Petri Vallium Sarnaii monarchi hystoria Albigensis*, in *The history of the Albigensian Crusade: Peter of Les-Vaux-de-Cernay's historia Albigensis*, trans. W. A. Sibly and Michael D. Sibly (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2002), 14.

[26]Even in his book *Against the Manicheans* (1210), written after his conversion to the Catholic faith, Durand of Huesca continued praising Waldo and his efforts of apostolic life. This might explain why several contemporary observers, including the Roman clergy, were unable to clearly distinguish between the movement of Poor Catholics and the Poor of Lyon. See Durand de Huesca, *Prologue of Liber Anti Heresies and Contra Manicheos* in Kurt-Victor Selge, "L'aile droite du mouvement Vaudois et naissance des Pauvres Catholiques et des pauvres réconcitiés," *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 2

Reconciled Poor were wearing perforated shoes, an anonymous document (c. 1209), attributed by some to Ermengaud of Béziers, described the Poor of Lyon and Waldenses in the same way as these new Catholic orders: "There are also other heretics who are called Lyonists from Lyon, Waldenses [Waldenses] from Valdes [Waldo], namely *Pauperes*, who say, 'we should not think about tomorrow'; *Dessotulati* [shoeless], because they wear perforated shoes."[27] This is an example of confusing the Poor Catholics with the Poor of Lyon because it clearly contradicts the letters about the shoes from Durand, Bernard Prim, and Innocent III, which affirm that the Poor Catholics wore perforated shoes in order to be different from the Poor of Lyon.

This document, combined with the injunctions of Innocent III, demonstrates that the Poor Catholics and the Poor of Lyon were regarded as one and the same by the local clergy. The Poor Catholics and its sub-group, the Reconciled Poor, retained too many of the characteristics of their past connection with the Poor of Lyon. Eventually the shoe controversy ended when Pope Innocent IV dissolved both groups and incorporated them into the Augustinian Hermit order in 1256.[28]

The Historical Development of the Shoe Theory

This section analyses the major sources that form the basis of the view that the words *sabbatati* and *insabbatati* are interpreted as evidence that the Waldenses are known for their unique shoeware. It is important to keep in mind that these views only originated after the introduction of the particular shoes by Durand as a special characteristic of the Poor Catholics he founded in 1208.

Ebrardus and *Xabatati*

The first person to establish connection between shoes and the variant of the name *Sabbatati*, was Ebrardus Bethuniensis, a Flemish grammarian from Béthune, northern France. The description he gives of the Waldenses seems to be based on his encounter with members of Durand's order of the Poor Catholics whose dress was close to that of the Waldenses, which made it easy to confuse both groups. In his work, *Antihaeresis liber*, (written between 1210 and 1212), he described what he thought were Waldenses as follows:

> About those who are called *Vallenses*. They are called like this because they dwell in the Valley of tears. They try to make themselves look like the Apostles of Christ so much that they place the Apostles of Christ in derision.

(1967): 231. Here Selge went as far as to call the Poor Catholics a "right wing" of the Waldensian movement. However, this assumption that the Poor Catholics and the Waldenses are part of the same movement is not supported by primary sources.

[27]Translation mine; "Sunt autem alii heretici qui vocantur lugdunenses a Lugduno, valdesii a Valdesio, scilicet pauperes, quia dicunt 'Se non cogitare in crastinum'; Dessotulati, quia pertusos sotulares ferunt" (Anonymous, "Manifestatio Haeresis Albigensium et Lugdunensium," in A. Dondaine, "Duran Huesca et la polemique anti-cathare," *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 29 [1959]: 271).

[28]Pierron, "Poor Catholics," 12:249–251; Kaeppeli, "contre les hérétiques," 334.

> They even want to be called *Xabatenses* from *Xabata* [shoes], rather than Christians from Christ. They rather crucify their shoes than their members, as they should. They crown their shoes rather than their head as Isaiah said: "*Rend your hearts and not your clothes*."[29]

Ebrardus's interpretation would fit the followers of Durand very well. However, in applying this description to the Waldenses, it has several problems. First, there is no evidence that Waldenses were called *Xabatenses*. The primary sources describing Waldenses list names such as *Insabbatati*, *Insabbatos* or *Sabbatati*, not *Xabatenses*. Second, no primary source used the word *xabatas* for the shoes of the Waldenses but always used the traditional Latin names *calcaementas*, *sotularis*, or *sandalis*. Third, the habit of wearing special or perforated shoes was not characteristic of the Waldenses, but of the Poor Catholics and the Reconciled Poor. Finally, the custom of wearing special shoes by Poor Catholics did not emerge until 1208 (the year when Durand abandoned the Poor of Lyon), while the word *Insabbatati* appeared already in 1192 and *Sabatati* in 1197. Thus, being unfamiliar with the unique mission of the Poor Catholics, Ebrardus's description seemed to be based on his encounter with Poor Catholics, not Waldenses.

Not everyone at that time defined *Insabbatati* as referring to shoes. Several decades later, the council of Tarragon (1242) defined the Waldenses as *Insabbatti*, who were described as opponents of Catholic practices, teachings, and religious and civil powers. *Insabbatati* were those "who refused to swear an oath, or to obey ecclesiastical or secular powers, or denied that a corporal punishment could be inflicted in any case."[30] This anti-Catholic attitude remained with the Waldenses throughout the centuries until they abandoned the historicist view of prophecy long after the Protestant Reformation.

Later Writers Followed Ebrardus

Due to the fact that Ebrardus lived during the time period of the shoe controversy (although not in the same region), later writers would seldom question his report.[31] Instead, his interpretation of the Waldenses as *Xabatenses*

[29]"Quidam autem qui *Vallenses* se appellant eo quod in Valle lacrymarum maneant, Apostolos Christi se faciunt tanquam Christi Apostolos habentes in derisum; et etiam *Xabatenses* a *Xabata* potius quam Christiani a Christo se volunt appellari. *Sotulares* cruciant, cum membra potius debeant cruciare. Calceamenta coronant caput autem non coronant cum Isaias dicat: *Scindite corda vestra, et non vistementa vestra*" (Ebrardus Bethuniensis, *Antihaeresis liber*, ch. 25, "Contre eos, qui dicuntur Xabatati," in Gonnet, *Enchiridion fontium Valdensium*, 144). Here the writer used the words *sotulares* and *calceamenta* as synonyms.

[30]"Insabbatati, qui dicunt in aliquo casu non esse iurandum, et potestatibus ecclesiasticis vel secularibus non esse obediendum, et poenam corporalem non esse infligendam in aliquo casu, et similia.' C. Baraut, 'Els inicis de la inquisició,' in Damien J. Smith, *Crusade, Heresy, and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon: c. 1167–1276* (Boston: Brill, 2010), 197.

[31]Several historians observed that Ebrardus was not a very reliable writer. In his writings against the Waldenses, he cited Isaiah for Joel, the book of Acts for

and the subsequent interpretation of *Insabbatati* as "shoe-wearers" would become a standard interpretation of the shoe-issue for many writers.

Bernard Gui (1261–1331), a Dominican priest and inquisitor in the province of Toulouse, central France, from 1307 to 1324, was the first person on record to have discussed the word *Insabbatati*, relating it to shoes. Gui reasoned as follows: "Furthermore, they are called Insabbatati because in the beginning the perfect Waldenses had a special mark in the form of a shield on their shoes (*sotularium*) to distinguish themselves from their accomplices and believers."[32] According to Gui, only the Waldensian leaders, called "perfect Valdenses," had been wearing a special type of shoes. He dates the origin of this type of shoes, saying that "in the beginning" the perfect Waldenses had a *sotularium* (a special mark on their shoes). This shows that Gui himself was not an eyewitness of the footwear of the Poor Catholics or the Poor of Lyon because his comment "in the beginning" indicates that at the time of Gui's writing—in the early part of the 1300s—the custom of wearing special shoes had disappeared.[33]

From Gui's time onward, historians writing about the Waldenses quoted Ebrardus and/or Gui as their primary sources for identifying the Waldenses as *insabbatati* or *sabbatati*. The reliance on these authors is clearly seen about 300 years later in the early 1600s, when Jacob Gretser (1565–1625), a Jesuit priest and apologist, published *Trias scriptorum adversus Waldensium sectam*.[34] In the "Praeloquia" of this book Gretser refuted the contention of some Protestants that the Waldenses formed the historic link between the apostolic church and the Reformation. In his refutation Gretser viewed the Waldenses simply as a

---

2 Thessalonians, and Nebuchadnezzar for Darius (ibid., 144–145, 148); Jacobus Gretser considered Ebrardus a grammarian who authored a Greek grammar. However, F. Vernet questioned this and described Ebrardus as a controversial person and pointed out some of his glaring mistakes in F. Vernet, "Ébrard ou Eberhard ou Evrard, de Béthune," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 4:1995–1998. Wakefield and Evans called Ebrardus's book "a work of little value; against dualists, with whom the author confuses the Waldenses, he also attacks Jews" (*Heresies*, 635).

[32]"Insabbatati autem dicti sunt quia olim a principio sui Valdenses perfecti speciale signum in modum quasi scuti in parte superiori sotularium deferebant, in quo signo ab aliis suis complicibus et credentibus differebant," Bernhard Gui, *Manuel De L'Inquisiteur* (Paris: Société d'édition les belles lettres, 1964), 36–38.

[33]Wakefield and Evans translate *olim a principio* as "from the beginning" (*Heresies*, 388). This translation suggests that the Waldenses were still wearing this unique footgear in the time of Gui. The Latin, however, does not support such translation. The correct translation is "formerly" or "in the beginning," which means that in Gui's time the Waldenses were no longer using this footwear. Janet Shirley renders this phrase in a similar way, stating, "early in their history" in Bernard Gui, *The Inquisitor's Guide: A Medieval Manual on Heretics* (Welwyn Garden City, UK: Ravenhall Books, 2006), 51. It seems that these Waldenses described by Gui are more related to the Cathars than to the simple Waldenses of the north of Italy who do not recognize such differences between "perfect" leaders and laity and don't refrain from being involved in manual labor.

[34]Gretser, "Praeloquia," 7–9.

recent heretical departure or offshoot from the Catholic Church instead of a remnant faithful to the doctrines of the apostles. Gretser partly borrowed his arguments from Ebrardus and introduced new arguments to prove that the word *Insabatatis* is the same as Ebrardus's *Xabatatos*. Gretser settled the etymological arguments, stating, "Many things have been said about the etymology of the words Xabatensium, Insabbatatorum, Sabbatatorum, Chabatatorum, however, Xabatatos comes from Xabata, Chabata, or Chapata, which means shoes."[35] However, he admitted that his reasoning on this etymology did not have the support of the literature of his day because these sources, he said, contained many errors.

In spite of the lack of support from contemporary sources seventeenth-century Huguenot historian Pierre Allix (1641–1717) uncritically followed Gretser in his interpretation on the Waldenses and Albigenses. Allix considered both groups as having basically the same beliefs, and they were called *insabbatati* because of the shoes they wore.[36] Allix, however, did not explain how this word related to shoes. The first Waldensian historian who accepted the traditional arguments regarding the shoe interpretation was Emilio Comba (1839–1904).[37] Comba, who traced the origin of the Waldenses from Waldo, affirmed that the Waldenses were called "Ensabatas or Insabatati" because they used to "cut the upper part" of their shoes. He said, "Catholics sometimes call them . . . Insabates, because of the sabates they were in the habit of wearing."[38] Today, most Waldenses have accepted the shoe interpretation originating with Waldo as the explanation of the names given them during the thirteenth century.[39]

A recent study on *Sabatati* explored the reason why there was such a controversy about the early Waldenses and their shoes. This study does not analyze in depth the origins of *sabatati* but sees this word and all its alternatives as referring to peculiar sandal-like shoes. Instead, the study shows that many clergy assumed that these unique shoes were related to the Waldensian

[35]"Multa dicuntur de Etymologia *Xabatensium*, *Insabbatatorum*, *Sabbatatorum*, *Chabatatorum*, videl, *Xabatatos* à *Xabata* seu *Chabata* vel *Chapata*, quod calceum significat" (ibid., 9. Italics by Gretser). See also Gretser, "Prolegomena," in *Lucae Tudensis episcopi*, 14.

[36]Pierre Allix, *Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of the Albigenses* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1821; 1st ed., London: Richard Chiswell, 1690), 195.

[37]Prior to Comba, Léger discussed the word *inzabatati*. He referred to the Spanish Jesuit Inquisitor Pegne (1542–1615), who reported that this term is related to Zabate which signified shoes (*Histoire générale des églises évangéliques*, 2:329) Léger did not indicate that he accepted Pegne's view as the correct meaning of that term.

[38]Emilio Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy, from Their Origin to the Reformation*, trans. Teofilo E. Comba (London: Truslove & Shirley, 1889), 250, 277, 309n167. His son, Teofilo Comba disagreed with his father about the origin of the Waldenses. He argued in favor of the older Waldensian view that this name was derived from the name valley and that they already existed before the time of Peter Waldo.

[39]See Amedeo Molnár, *Storia dei Valdesi*, 2 vols. (Torino: Claudiana, 1974), 1:45.

preachers' assertion to apostolic holiness and authority that conflict with the power of the Catholic clergy. This was seen as a threat to the influence of the clergy and their authority on the believers. At that time of the Middle Ages shoes of the clergy had also a mystical and symbolic significance and revealed a person's status among the religious hierarchy.[40] Here one can observe the growing concern of the clergy about the type of shoes what were introduced by Durand and his new order of the Poor Catholics. Because the author considers the Poor Catholics a part of the Waldensian movement, one can see why he applies the wearing of unique shoes to the Waldenses as a whole. Unfortunately, to consider the Poor Catholics as part of the Waldenses is not in harmony with the primary sources. Therefore, he has not demonstrated that this unique type of shoes or sandals was used by the early Waldenses. However, he clearly shows the anxiety of the Catholic clergy because they had difficulty seeing any difference between the Poor Catholics and the Waldenses.

The Holy Days Theory

This section analyzes the evidence historians have presented in support of the second major interpretation that the labels *insabbatati* and *sabbatati* were used to refer to the Waldenses' persistent refusal to observe Catholic holy days, festivals, or any teachings that were not explicitly taught in the Bible.

If we look at the primary sources, we can notice that the title *Insabbatati* continues to be used many years after the shoe controversy. The reason for its continued use goes back to the Council of Tarragon (1242), where the name *Insabbatati* was mentioned in connection with the "Waldensian sect" in Spain. The constitutions of this council shed additional light on its meaning by explaining that the "*Insabbatati*" were those "who refused to swear an oath, or to obey ecclesiastical or secular powers, or denied that a corporal punishment could be inflicted in any case."[41] Here it shows that the *Insabbatati* are those who oppose certain Catholic practices and teachings. The document "Sacramentum Vicariurum" in the Constitutionibus Catalaniae Manuscripts from the second half of the thirteenth century (c. 1270) calls the Waldenses "Sabatatos." [42] No explanation was provided for the meaning of this name. The fact that the terms in question first appear in the Kingdom of Aragon a decade and half before the shoe controversy and continue to be used for almost half a century after it suggests that the appellations seem to bear no

[40]Hoose, "The *Sabatati*," 357.

[41]"Insabbatati, qui dicunt in aliquo casu non esse iurandum, et potestatibus ecclesiasticis vel secularibus non esse obediendum, et poenam corporalem non esse infligendam in aliquo casu, et similia" C. Baraut, "Els inicis de la inquisició," in Damien J. Smith, *Crusade, Heresy, and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon: c. 1167–1276* (Boston: Brill, 2010), 197.

[42]Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 4:718. "Sacramentum Vicariurum" was issued during the time of James I of Aragon (1213–1278), but probably after the Council of Tarragon in 1242.

specific relation to shoes but to an anti-Catholic posture of the Waldenses.[43] The following arguments have been used in support of this view.

The Waldenesian Self-image

Since the earliest Waldensian records were destroyed by fire during times of persecution,[44] the first Waldensian testimony about the designation *insabbatati* comes from the Vaudois pastor and historian, Jean Perrin (1580–1648). Describing the situation in 1618, Perrin wrote, "The Waldenses rejected the Romish festivals and observed no other day of rest than Sunday; whence they were named 'Insabbathas,' regarders not of the Sabbaths."[45]

Perrin's explanation showed that the use of the prefix *in-* of the word *insabbatati* expresses a negation of the root word *sabbat*, indicating that the Waldenses rejected Catholic holy or rest days, called sabbaths.[46] In his explanation, Perrin reflected the Waldensian historic self-image of being

[43]Robert Robinson (1735–1790) linked the origin of *sabbatati* to the Sabbaths of the Jews. He argued that it was "most probable" that this name was given to the people who inhabited the area of the town of Sabadell, near Barcelona, Spain, which was residence of many rich Jews (*Ecclesiastical Researches* [Cambridge: Francis Hodson, 1792], 310).

[44]Being viewed as a heretical movement, all Waldensian documents were destroyed during the repeated persecutions, which is the reason for a lack of their primary sources during the Middle Ages. See Samuel Morland, *The History of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of the Piedmont* (London, Henry Hills, 1658), 8; James Hastings, "Karaites," *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 7:665. In 1248, for instance, well before the invention of modern printing, fourteen wagon-loads of "heretical" literature were burned at one time in Paris. (Henry Charles Lea, *The Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1993), 250–251. As the Bible was the main source against the Roman Catholic Church, the Council of Tarragon in 1234 decreed the following: "Nobody was to have books of the Old or New Testament in the vernacular. If they did so, within eight days of their knowing of the publication of the constitution, they were to hand the books over to their bishop for them to be burnt. If they did not do so, whether they were a cleric or a layperson, they were to be held suspect of heresy until they purged themselves" (Smith, *Crusade, Heresy, and Inquisition*, 185).

[45]Perrin, *History of the Ancient Christians Inhabiting the Valleys of the Alps*, 25. His original work was published in 1618. The 1618 and 1619 French editions read, "Et d'autant qu'ils n'obseruoyent autre iour de repos que le Dimanche, ils les appellerent Insabathas, comme qui diroit n'obseruans aucun Sabath" (idem, *Histoire des Vaudois* [Geneva, 1618], 9). Literal translation reads, "Since they [Waldenses] did not observe any other day of rest than Sunday, they called them 'Insabbathas,' as to say that they would not observe any Sabbath."

[46]In this case, the word "Sabbath" meant a festival instituted by the Catholic Church, which the Waldenses rejected because the Bible did not mandate them. In the medieval literature, *sabbatum*, in the sense of rest, was sometimes used for Sunday and at other times for Catholic holy days such as Passover Sabbath (Sabbatum Magnum) and Palm Sunday (Sabbatum Vacat). See Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 4:718.

followers of the simple apostolic teachings.[47] This view continued to be advocated by the Waldenses until the end of the nineteenth century.

Non-Waldensian Historians Support the Holy Days Theory

Prior to Perrin, the Huguenot historian, Nicolas Vignier, wrote in his *La Bibliothèque Historiale* (1588) that Waldenses "were called Insabathaires, because they despised the [Catholic] feasts."[48] Dutch historian Balthasar Lydius (1577–1629) followed Vignier and Perrin arguing that, since the Waldenses "observed no other day of rest or holiday, than Sunday, they were styled *Insabbathi* or *Insabbathas*, that is, *Sabbathless*, or not observing Sabbaths."[49] In 1701, German Calvinist theologian and historian Friedrich Spanheim the Younger (1632–1701) also concluded that the Waldenses were called "Sabbatati because they rejected Papal feasts, only observing the Lord's Day."[50]

Even some Catholic authorities mentioned the "No Sabbath" theory. In the second half of the seventeenth century, a church history series was published, authored by Natalis Alexander (1639–1724), a Dominican theologian and church historian. Natalis opined that the word "Insabbathati" was given to the Waldenses "because they celebrated no Sabbaths or Festal days, nor did they cease from their work on the Catholic sacred days consecrated to the worship of Christ, the Blessed Virgin and the Saints."[51] Here again the word *Sabbath* referred to Catholic feast days.[52] This view was also maintained among several nineteenth century scholars.[53]

[47]Studies such as Peter Biller, "The Oral and the Written: The Case of the Alpine Waldensians," in *Bulletin of the Society for Renaissance Studies* 4 (1986): 19–28 and Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent*, 143–160, have re-addressed the validity and the importance of Waldensian oral tradition, of which Perrin is one of the earliest representatives.

[48]"Insabathaires, pource qu'ils mesprisoye[n]t les festes," (Nicolas Vignier, *La Bibliotheque Historiale*, 3 vols. [Paris: L'Angleir, 1588], 3:130).

[49]D. Balthasar Lydius, *History of the Waldenses*, quoted in Thieleman J. van Braght, *The Bloody Theater or Martyrs Mirror of the Defenseless Christians (1660)*, trans. Joseph F. Sohm (Elkhart, IN: n.p., 1886; repr., Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 2002), 277.

[50]"Sabbatati, quod, Festis Papisticis repudiatis, solum diem Dominicum obsevarent," (Friedrich Spanheim, *Geographiam, Chronologiam et Historiam Sacram atque Ecclesiasticam* in vol. 1 of *Opera* [Leiden: Cornelium Boutestein, 1701], 1597). He applied *Sabbatati* to both the Waldeness and Albigenses.

[51]Natalis Alexander, *Selecta historiae ecclesiasticae veteris testamenti capita et in loca ejusdem insignia. Dissertationess historicae, chronologicae, criticae*. 25 vols. (Paris: Dezallier, 1689), 17:367.

[52]Note, for example, that Catholics called Palm Sunday, "Sabbatum Vacat." See Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 4:719.

[53]See William Jones, *History of the Waldenses; Connected with a Sketch of the Christian Church from the Birth of Christ to the Eighteenth Century* (London: R. W. Pomeroy, 1812), 340; Joseph Milner, *The History of the Church of Christ from the Days of the Apostles, till the Famous Disputation between Luther and Miltitz in 1520* (Edinburgh: Peter Brown & Thomas Nelson, 1835), 536; Antoine Monastier, *Histoire*

Primary Evidence for the Holy Days Theory

One of the earliest primary sources that describe the Waldensian rejection of Catholic holy days and festivals is a tract ascribed to David of Augsburg, written around 1260. The tract mentioned the Waldensian attitude toward Catholic festivals: "On the festive days, if they can do that with safety, they work, arguing that it is alright to work. [They say] it is good to labor on the days of the feast and not bad."[54]

Speaking of the Waldenses, Bernard Gui affirmed that they did indeed reject many Catholic holy days. He described "the Poor of Lyon," which he identified as Waldenses, as teaching that "no days are to be kept holy except the Lord's Day and the feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and, say some, those of the apostles and evangelists."[55]

A fourteenth century inquisitional tract from Bohemia titled *De Valdensibus Eorumque Doctrina et Moribus*, characterized the Waldenses as follows: "They despise the feast of Easter and all other festivals of Christ and the saints because of their being multiplied to that vast number and say that one day is as good as another and work upon holydays where they can do it."[56]

Pope Pius II (Aeneas Sylvanus Piccolomini, 1405–1464) enumerates the errors of the Waldenses in his book *Historia Bohemica* and asserts that the Hussite movement was infected by the Waldensian heresy (*Valdensium sectam . . . pestiferae*). Some of the errors of the Waldenses in Bohemia were the following: "They cease from work on no day, except on the Lord's Day. The celebrations of saints' days they reject altogether. The fast days instituted by the Church have no merit."[57]

---

de l'église Vaudoise depuis son origine et des Vaudois du Piémont jusqu'à nos jours, 2 vols. (Paris: Delay, 1847), 1:72–73; Harvey Newcomb, *History of the Waldenses* (Boston: Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, 1845), 11. In 1842, Thomas Smyth authored "The Antiquity of Presbytery," in *Complete Works of Rev. Thomas Smyth D. D.*, 10 vols. (Columbia, SC: R. L. Bryan Company, 1908), 2:502n1.

[54]"diebus festivis**,** ubi caute possunt**,** operantur, arguentes quod cum operari bonum sit, bona in die festo agere non sit malum," (David of Augsburg, *Tractatum de Haeresis Pauperum de Lugduno* in Edmond Martène, *Thesaurus Novum Anecdotorum*, 25 vols. [Paris: Florentini Delaulne, 1717], 5:1780. Brackets mine).

[55]"de festis non colendis preter diem dominicum et festa beate Marie Virginis, el aliqui addunt apostolorum et evangelistarum," (Gui, *Practica Inqusitionis Heretice Pravitatis* [Toulouse: A. Chauvin, 1886], 248; Gui, *Inquisiteur*, 48, trans. Janet Shirley, *Inquisitor's Guide*, 55–56).

[56]"Festum Paschae et Omnia festa Christi et Santorum spernunt, propter multiplicationem festorum et dicunt que unus dies sit sicut alius et in festo operantur occulte" (Anonymous, *De Valdensibus Eorumque Doctrina et Moribus* in *Rerum Bohemicarum Antiqui Scriptores* [Hannover: C. Marnium et heredes I. Aubrii, 1602], 224; cf. the translation in Peter Allix, *Some Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont* [London: Richard Chiswell, 1690], 217, 229). The last part of the sentence should be translated as "and on holydays they secretly work."

[57]"Nulla die ab opere cessandum, nisi qua Dominica nunc appellatur. Celebritates Sanctorum prorsus reiiciendas. Ieiuniis quoque ab ecclesia institutis, nihil inesse

The above observation of historians that Waldenses rejected Catholic holy days and festivals from the earliest times onward was also recognized by supporters of the shoe theory.[58]

Waldensian Sabbath-keepers

During the early part of the seventeenth century the Swiss historian, Melchior Goldastus (1576–1635), commented on Emperor Frederic II's 1220 constitution against heretics. Goldastus reasoned that the label "Insabbatati" was used to describe some heretics during the thirteenth century "because they judaize on the Sabbath" or kept the Sabbath like the Jews.[59] He mentioned that the "Valdenses" were often called "Insabbatati,"[60] indicating that during that time there were Waldenses who kept the seventh-day Sabbath (Saturday) as a holy day of rest.

Evidence of Waldensian Sabbath keepers during the first half of the thirteenth century is brought out in a polemic[61] about c. 1241–1244 by the Inquisitor Father Moneta of Cremona, northern Italy, who defended himself against the criticism of the Cathari and Waldenses that Catholics were transgressors of the Sabbath commandment. In his treatise against these believers, in a chapter entitled "*De Sabbato, & de die Dominico*," he discussed the significance of the seventh-day Sabbath of Exod 20:8, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy" in contrast to the value of the Lord's day, the first day.[62]

In defending himself against their criticism that Catholics were transgressors of the Sabbath commandment, Moneta pointed out that the Sabbath was for the Jews a memorial of creation and their liberation from Egypt. He argued that the Jewish sabbath was "a sign and figure of the spiritual sabbath of the Christian people. . . . It must be understood, however,

---

meriti" (Aeneas Sylvanus Piccolomini, *Historia Bohemica*, in *Rerum Bohemicorum Antiqui Scriptores* [Hannover: Claudium, 1602], 141; cf. the translation in Peter Allix, *Some Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont*, 220).

[58]Even Grester affirmed that the Waldenses "completely banished all festivals" (Gretser, "Prolegomena" in *Lucae Tudensis episcopi*, 14).

[59]Melchior Goldastus, *Rationale Constitutionum Imperialium* (Frankfurt am Main, 1607), 78. Compare with Gretser, "Prolegomena" in *Lucae Tudensis episcopi*, 14.

[60]"sed quod in Sabbato judaizarent," (Goldastus, *Rationale Constitutionum Imperialium*, 78).

[61]For the 1241–1244 date of Moneta's book, see Thomas Kaeppeli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, 4 vols. (Rome: S. Sabinae, 1980), 3:137–139; Christine Caldwell Ames, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 195.

[62]Moneta and Tommaso Agostino Ricchini. *Venerabilis Patris Monetæ Cremonensis ordinis prædicatorum S. P. Dominico Æqualis adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque: Quos ex manuscriptis codd. Vaticano, Bononiensi, ac Neapolitano*, (Rome: Palearini, 1743; repr., Ridgewood, NJ: Gregg, 1964), 475.

that as the Jews observed the sabbath, so also, we observe the Lord's day."[63] He added, "this day we observe as an ordinance of the Church, and it is in reverence to Christ who was born on that day, who rose on that day, who sent the Holy Spirit on that day."[64]

Moneta defended the observance of the Lord's Day as an ordinance of the Church with the question, "If the Jews declared that we have to keep the sabbath as a memorial of the benefit of their liberation, to honor their liberator, why is the church not allowed to institute a festive day in honor of Christ, in remembrance of the spiritual freedom from the bondage of the devil, accomplished by Christ?"[65]

Moneta concluded his dispute by referring to the apostle Paul's letters to the Galatians and Colossians, stating, "Against these heretics, namely the Cathari and Waldenses, it is that we find what is written in Galatians 4:10 '*Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years*' and it adds in verse 11: '*I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you*,' indeed the result is that you '*labour in vain*'; therefore it is sin to observe days."[66] He continued, "Likewise Colossians 2:16 declares: '*Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days*.'"[67]

Referring to Gal 5:2–3, Moneta pointed out that "the Apostle argued that those who Judaize, who were following the precepts of the law of the Lord, who also observed circumcision that 'if ye be circumcised, Christ will be of no benefit to you.'"[68] This argument against circumcision he applied to the keeping of the Sabbath.

Moneta added, "Similarly, it is said in Colossians 2. '*Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day*,' that is, of the Jews; hence, this is the day of the feast explained by the new moon or the Sabbath.

[63]"signum fuit & figura sabbati spiritualis in populo Christiano. . . . Sciendum autem quod sicut Judaei sabbatum observant, ita etiam nos observamus diem Dominicum" (ibid.).

[64]"quem diem nos observamus ex constitutione Ecclesiae: & ob reverentiam Christi, qui illo die natus est; illo die resurrexit; illo die Spiritum Sanctum misit" (ibid.).

[65]"Si enim Judaeis indictum est servare sabbatum in memoriam beneficii liberationis materialis, ad honorem liberatoris; cur non licebit Ecclesiae constituere illum diem esse festivum ad honorem Christi, & in memoriam liberationis spiritualis de servitute diaboli facta per Christum?" (ibid.).

[66]"Contra istud objicit haereticus, scilicet Catharus & Valdensis id quod habetur ad Galatas 4. v. 10 *Dies observatis, menses, & tempora, & annas*; & subdit v. 11. *Timeo, ne forte sine causa*, idest fructu, *laboraverim in vobis*; Ergo peccatum est observare dies" (ibid.).

[67]"Item ad Collossenses 2. v. 16. *Nema ergo vos judicet in cibo, aut in potu, aut in parte diei festi, aut neomeniae, aut sabbatorum*" (ibid.).

[68]"Apostolus arguebat eos qui Judaizabant, idest more Judaeorum illa observabant, quae; praecepta erant in lege Domini, propter quod etiam observabant circumcisionem; unde eos arguens dicit cap. 5. v. 1. Quoniam si circumcidamini, Christus vobis nihil proderit" (ibid.).

Therefore the days of the Jewish feasts are not to be observed, but the days instituted by the Church, as stated above."[69]

Moneta's defence of Sunday as the Lord's Day in place of the seventh-day Sabbath clearly show that there were Waldenses and Cathars in northern Italy during the thirteenth century whom Catholics persecuted and considered heretics because they worshipped on another day than Sunday, namely the seventh-day Sabbath.

Although there is no record that Waldo and his followers observed the seventh-day Sabbath, we know that several movements related to the Waldenses were reported to observe this custom. The Waldensian historian, Emilio Comba, admits that northern Italy was a stronghold of various dissident groups associated with the Waldenses, some of which kept the Sabbath and often influenced and merged with the various groups of the Poor of Lyon and Poor Lombards.[70]

Sabbath keeping among the Waldenses was most widespread in Bohemia and Moravia. An inquisitor's manuscript from the fifteenth century reports that Waldenses in Bohemia "do not celebrate the feasts of the blessed virgin Mary and the Apostles, except the Lord's day. Not a few celebrate the Sabbath with the Jews."[71] In Picardy, in northern France, there was a Sabbath-keeping Waldensian group of Douai, who were called Tourloupins. Most historians identify Tourlupins with the Picardian branch of Waldenses.[72] A company of them was arrested in 1420. Well-preserved manuscripts mention that they "upheld that the Saturday must be celebrated instead of Sunday."[73]

From the various accounts of Waldenses rejecting holy days, festivals or

[69]"Similiter quod dicitur ad Collossens. 2. *Nemo ergo vos judicet in cibo aut in potu, aut in parte diei festi,* scilicet Judaici; unde etiam diem festum per partem exponens ait: *aut neomenia*, *aut Sabbatorum.* Dies ergo festi Judici non sunt abservandi, sed dies ab Ecclesia instituti, ut dictum est" (ibid., 476–477).

[70]See Bonacursus, *Vita Haereticorum* 10D (PL 204:784), quoted in Comba, *Waldo and the Waldensians before the Reformation* (New York: R. Carter, 1880), 35. John M'Clintock and James Strong, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, 12 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1874), 1:660, agrees with Comba: "Traces of Sabbath-keepers are found in . . . the twelfth century in Lombardy." Allix also admits that many confused Waldenses with Patareni, Arnaldisti, and Passagini (Peter Allix, *Some upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont*, new ed. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821], 185).

[71]"festa divae virginis Mariae et Apostolorum non celebrant, solam diem Dominicam aliqui. Nonnulli vero cum Judaeis sabbatum celebrant" (Johann Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 2 vols. [Munich: Beck, 1890], 2:662).

[72]George William Kitchin, *A History of France*, 4th ed., 3 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899), 1:488; Henri Martin, *Histoire de France*, 17 vols. (Paris: Furne, 1864), 5:309; Perrin, *Histoire des Vaudois*, 9.

[73]Jean Baptiste Francois Hennebert, *Histoire de la Province d'Artois*, 3 vols. (St. Omer: F. Boubers, 1789) 3:348–349; Paul Beuzart, *Les hérésies pendant le Moyen-Âge et la Réforme jusqu'à la mort de Philippe II, 1598, dans la région de Douai, d'Arras et au pays de l'Alleu* (Le Puy, France: F. Boubers, 1912), 47.

sabbaths, it is not surprising that, as late as the time of archbishop James Usher (1581–1656), there were many who believed that *insabbatati* referred to those Waldenses who worshiped by judaizing on the Sabbath.[74] Concerning the word *insabbatati*, Jesuit Inquisitor Pegne also admitted that "many used to think it came from Sabbath, and that they [Waldenses] observed the Sabbath according to the custom of the Jews."[75]

Etymological Arguments

This section focuses on the analysis of the roots of *insabbatati* and *sabbatati* in lexicons and the morphology of these words, a study that is absent in the study of these words. The result is that it is a strong possibility that *insabbatati*, as used to describe the Waldenses, is associated with a rejection of Catholic holy days and practices and therefore is an argument in favor of the Holy Days theory.

One notices that classical dictionaries do not mention *sabbatati* or *insabbatati*. These words appear only later in Medieval Latin and Provençal dictionaries, which define them either as referring to heretics or to the type of shoes of the Waldenses.[76] The Latin word *sabbatum* was the common word for Sabbath, and is in its basic form a noun.[77] In classical dictionaries, the root of these Latin words is *sabbat*, which is connected to the Jewish word *sabbat* meaning the seventh-day of the week—Sabbath.[78]

[74]James Ussher, *De Christianarum ecclesiarum succession*, in *The Whole Works*, 18 vols. (London: B. Norton, 1613), 2:234.

[75]Francis Pegne, "Commentary XXV," in Nicolaus Eymericus, *Directorium inquisitorum* (Venice: Zalterius, 1607), 225a. An instance of Sabbath keeping was Valère Gross, a Vaudois pastor of Maneille and St. Martin, Piedmont, one of the two pastors who survived the plague of 1630. In 1615, monks accused him of "being, not a Christian, but a Jew, because he observed no other holydays than the weekly Sabbath" (*Sketches of the Waldenses* [London: The Religious Tract Society, 1846], 113, 129, 133; Sophia Bompiani, *A Short History of the Italian Waldenses* [New York: A. S. Barnes, 1899], 105).

[76]In the Provençal language, Emil Levy quotes François Juste Marie Raynouard's definition that simply explained the name *ensabatat* as being a Waldensian sect (Emil Levy and Raynouard, *Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch: Berichtigungen und Ergänzungen zu Raynouards Lexique Roman*, 8 vols. [Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1892–1924], 3:28).

[77]Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 4:718; Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary Founded on the Translation of Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*, rev. and enl. ed. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1879), 1609; F. P. Leverett, *A New and Copious Lexicon of the Latin Language* (Boston: J. H. Wilkins and R. B. Carter, 1840), 787; R. E. Latham, J. H. Baxter, and C. Johnson, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-list from British and Irish Sources* (London: British Academy, 1965), 414; *Lexicon Latinitatis medii aevi: Praesertim ad res ecclesiasticas investigandas pertinens, Corpus Christianorum*, ed. Albert Blaise (Turnholt: Brepols, 1975), 808; J. F. Niermeyer and C. van de Kieft, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, 2 vols. (Boston: Brill, 2002), 2:1207.

[78]"Sabbatum," *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*, 4:n.p.; "sabbata," *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 1673; "sabbatum" in Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, 1609.

Etymological dictionaries dealing with the high Middle Ages do not reveal a direct linguistic connection from *Xabatatos*, *Xabatenses*, *Xabata*, *Chabata*, and *Chapata* to shoes, as Gretser suggested. Medieval dictionaries dealing with etymology, including Du Cange's lexicon, mention that this root was derived from the Hebrew word Sabbath, meaning rest.[79] A later edited reprint edition of Du Cange added the meaning of shoes to the root *sabbat* as a Latinized form of the Spanish, Portuguese, or French words for shoes—*zapato*, *sapato*, and *sabot*, and the meaning of certain Catholic festivals.[80] The common word for shoes in Latin is *calceus*,[81] while the word for sandals is *sandalium*.[82]

From linguistic morphology, the word *insabbatati* is composed of a prefix *in-*, the root *sabbat*, and the suffix *-atus*. The suffix *-atus* is commonly used to form participles and adjectives, and sometimes nouns.[83] The prefix *in-* can be added to verbal participles, adjectives, and nouns as negating the meaning of the word. This is the most common case. From our findings, it became clear that the prefix *in-* of the word *insabbatati* signified a negation of the word *sabbatati*.[84] In the light of the "Holy Days" theory, this understanding

[79]Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 4:718.

[80]Ibid. See also Joan Corominas, *Diccionario critico etimologico de la lengua Castellana*, 4 vols. (Bern: Francke, 1970), 4:834. Du Cange mentioned that in medieval literature the Spanish word *zapato* was Latinized into Latin word *sabatem*. The earliest occurrence of this Latinization, according to Du Cange, is recorded in the documents of the King Peter IV of Aragon from 1340s. J. Coromines, *Diccionario critico etimologico castellano e hispanico*, 7 vols. (Madrid: Gredos, 1987), 4:834, says: "there is a latinized form (of the word zapato) sabbatum in the statutes of Arles, and also sabaterius is frequently found in the same sources since 1252." The early forms of Latinization could explain where Ebrardus might have gotten the idea of *insabbatati* being connected with the shoes.

[81]Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, 267, 1626. Other words for shoes were *calceolus*, *calciamen*, *calciamentum*, *calciatus*, and *subtalares* (Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 4:718).

[82]Variant words for sandals were *crepidatus*, *obstrigillus*, and *solea* (Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, 480, 1245, 1718).

[83]Peter Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, 5 vols. (Munich: Beck, 2000), 2:83.

[84]In the case of the word *insabbatati*, the use of the prefix *in-* as a negation would fit the different meanings of the root *sabbat* the best for some of the following reasons: (1) This use is the most common usage of the prefix *in-* (ibid., 2:130.1–9); (2) The negative meaning can be applied to the word independently if it is a participle, adjective, or noun (see ibid.). However, the prefix *in-* can be used in the sense of the preposition "in" only to form nouns (ibid., 2:130.10); (3) According to Fournier, Diderot, and Raynouard, the word *ensabatat* is an adjective used as a noun, which, in this case, indicates a negation or negative meaning of the word and rules out the possibility of its meaning to be linked with the sense of the preposition *in* (Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert, eds., *Encyclopédie, ou, dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, par une société de gens de lettres*, 28 vols. [Paris: Briasson, 1782], 12:492). See also, Fournier, *Bibliothèque*, 248; Raynouard, *Lexique roman ou dictionnaire de la langue des troubadours*, 5 vols. (Heidelberg: Winter, 1928), 5:121.

makes sense because the label *insabbatati* signifies the Waldensian rejection of Catholic festivals, holy days, or sabbaths.

Conclusion

Since the Middle Ages, historians have characterized the Waldenses by the uncomplimentary names *insabbatati* and *sabbatati* to indicate their unique attire by the type of shoes they wore, or their unique belief in rejecting Catholic holy days or festivals and practices. The research underlying this article has tried to decode the confusion surrounding these names. This has led to the following insights for historiography, previously unnoticed.

From the analysis of the shoe theory, the research brought out that the wearing of perforated shoes was not introduced by or was not the custom of the Waldenses or the Poor of Lyon, but it was a custom introduced by the Poor Catholics and the Reconciled Poor. This custom was abolished by the command of Innocent III early in the thirteenth century. Bernard Gui attested to that fact, saying that he was not an eyewitness of such shoe-wearing, but that such custom was "in the beginning" followed by the leaders of what he assumed was the Waldensian movement.

Furthermore, the research showed that Ebrardus, who is often considered as a reliable primary source, confused the Waldenses with the Poor Catholics, which were characterized by the wearing of perforated shoes. Ebrardus also did not seem to realize that the label *Sabatati* predated the appearance of the shoe controversy, and could not therefore refer to the perforated shoes of the Poor Catholics. Later authors adopted Ebrardus's conjecture as a first-hand report and thus a primary authority. This made the shoe-theory the most widely accepted explanation for names *Insabbatati* and *Sabbatati* today.

The analysis of the second major interpretation of the Waldensian names *insabbatati* and *sabbatati* as characteristic of their faith or belief, expressing their rejection of Catholic festivals, holy days, or sabbaths, led to the following observations:

1. This interpretation is in harmony with the longstanding historic self-image of the Waldenses. It was the prevalent view in the earliest Waldensian literature and revealed that the unique practice of the earliest Waldenses was to refuse to observe Catholic holy days and teachings. The Waldenses held to this view for centuries.

2. The primary sources do confirm the Waldensian practice of opposition to Catholic holy days, Sabbaths, and teachings for centuries, while the wearing of unique shoes was only of very short duration during the first half of the thirteenth century. Furthermore, the wearing of unique shoes would have made them an easy target of the inquisition, which could be easily avoided by changing their shoes.

Hugh James's analysis of this word also concludes that the prefix *in-* would be either a negation (in privative) or a misspelled form of *ex-* with the idea of exclusion (*ex-sabatati*) (Hugh James, "The Waldenses," *The British Magazine and Monthly Register of Religious and Ecclesiastical Information, Parochial History, and Documents Respecting the State of the Poor, Progress of Education, Etc.*, [London: J. Petheram, 1839], 15:185).

3. Etymological arguments support the Waldensian opposition to the Catholic holy days and teachings not advocated by the Bible. From a linguistic viewpoint, it is the best explanation for the meaning of the prefix *in-* in *insabbatati* describing their mission of reform to call people back from the traditions of the Catholic Church to the simple apostolic practices of the early Christians. It also gives support to their claim that they were not a new religious movement of the twelfth century as Catholics had argued, but that the beliefs of the Waldenses had their spiritual roots in the apostolic faith as set forth in the Bible.

4. The term *sabbatati* also could have been used to describe some groups of Waldenses who followed the Jewish practice of resting on the Sabbath. This fits the meaning of both *Insabbatati* as depicting the rejection of Catholic holy days, Sabbaths, and teachings, and *sabbatati* describing the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. Primary sources show that one inquisitor in the thirteenth century wrote a book against the Waldenses and Cathars in which he refuted their criticism that Roman Catholics observed Sunday instead of the seventh-day Sabbath. This is evidence that there were Waldenses and Cathars who kept the seventh-day Sabbath during the high Middle Ages. Additional evidence shows that several groups closely associated and considered part of the Waldensian movement did indeed keep the seventh-day Sabbath as early as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

In summary, this research demonstrates that the interpretation based on Waldensian wearing of special type of shoes is not as strong as historians have assumed. Also, there is no evidence that historians expounding the shoe interpretation have done a linguistic analysis of these words in the context of the primary sources. It is important to note that none of the historians of this view offered any explanation for the use of the two distinct words, *insabbatati* and *sabbatati*, although linguistically these terms are opposite in meaning. In the light of the morphology of these names, evidence points to the second interpretation because it better explains the prominent characteristic of the belief of the Waldenses as a reform movement.

Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 54, No. 2, 259–298.

THE CONJUGAL EXPERIENCE OF JAMES AND ELLEN WHITE: MEANINGS BUILT BY THE COUPLE

Demóstenes Neves da Silva
Latin American Adventist
Theological Seminary
Bahia, Brazil

Gerson Rodrigues
Latin American Adventist
Theological Seminary
Bahia, Brazil

The story of James White (1821–1881) and Ellen Gould White (1827–1915), co-founders and leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, begins in the nineteenth century in the United States.[1] They were married on 30 August 1846, when James was twenty-five and Ellen eighteen.[2] The Whites

[1]Ellen G. White, *A Sketch of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White* (Saratoga Springs, NY: James White, 1851); idem, *Spiritual Gifts. My Christian Experience, Views and Labors in Connection with the Rise and Progress of the Third Angel's Message*, 4 vols. (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1860), 2:iii–iv, 7–300; James White, *Life Incidents: In Connection with the Great Advent Movement as Illustrated by the Three Angels of Revelation XIV* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1868; repr., Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2003); E. G. White, *Testimonies for the Church with a Biographical Sketch of the Author*, 9 vols. (Battle Creek, MI: Review & Herald, 1885), 1:9–112; J. White and E. G. White, *Life Sketches: Ancestry, Early Life, Christian Experience, and Extensive Labors of Elder James White, and His Wife Mrs. Ellen G. White* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1880; rev. ed., Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1888). The most relevant secondary sources on James and Ellen White, are Virgil E. Robinson, *James White* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1976); Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6 vols. (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1981–1986); Gerald Wheeler, *James White: Innovator and Overcomer* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2003).

This article is not intended to be exhaustive or definitive, but to provide an analysis from empirical data obtained from documents produced mainly by the couple and to consider their experiences in light of the cultural-historical context in which they lived. The findings are the result of the research proposal, thus, the method can be followed by another researcher in order to check the data and confirm the results. However, based on the set of investigated documents, the authors believe that there is nothing that denies the humanity and fragility of both, emphasizes their shortcomings, or indicates Ellen and James's perfection. It is only the picture that the data analysis presents of both during a certain critical period of their lives without pretending to establish any value judgment. Still, the authors acknowledge the limitations of time and space of a broader and more refined analysis in this complex issue, the conjugality of the Whites, a theme that is open to further investigation. Therefore, the object of research is still open to other methods that can identify how and if, for example, James's crisis would relate to Ellen White (aspect not identified in available data) and to what extent it affected the dynamics of the couple, but this is a topic for other research.

[2]J. White and E. G. White, *Life Sketches* (1880), 126, 238. Ellen's young age at marriage was below the average for the middle nineteenth century in America; young women were delaying marriage to a mean age of 24.4 in 1839 (James M. Volo and Dorothy Denneen Volo, *Family Life in Nineteenth-century America* [Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2007], 33).

were members of the great Adventist religious movement led by Baptist preacher William Miller. The Seventh-day Adventist Church grew out of this movement and was formally organized in 1863.[3] The growing denomination emerged in a country of continental dimensions, and new church members were spread over that vast territory. A strong sense of evangelistic duty and mission drove James, Ellen, and other pioneers to travel extensively with the aim of expanding and consolidating the new church.[4] James became a writer, preacher, administrator, and tireless traveler who announced the Advent message; Ellen would become the most prolific writer of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and the denomination would recognize her as a messenger chosen by God to lead and guide the church through the gift of prophecy.[5] As they reconsidered their personal beliefs and sought a biblical basis for their faith, James and Ellen White wrote constantly to guide, indoctrinate, motivate, and unify church members.[6]

Relevance of this Research

The study of the Whites' marriage is relevant because marriage and family issues are part of the Adventist message, contained in the church's core beliefs, and disseminated through its books, magazine articles, and television programs. The church maintains the Department of Family Ministries, which focuses on marriage and is present from the local church level to the highest denominational level, the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.[7] The teachings of Ellen White are an important part of the Adventist Christian family model, and James and Ellen played key roles in the formation of the theological mentality of the Adventist Church. Their teachings and testimony have a great impact on Adventist Church members and their practices, including marital ones. Therefore, one important question to be

[3]George R. Knight, *William Miller and the Rise of Adventism* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2010), 13–205; Andrew Gordon Mustard, "James White and the Development of Seventh-day Adventist Organization, 1844–1881" (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1987), 117–162.

[4]P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977; repr., Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1988), 165–292.

[5]For a general understanding of Ellen G. White's ministry and its acceptance among Adventists, see *Witness of the Pioneers Concerning the Spirit of Prophecy: A Facsimile Reprint of Periodical and Pamphlet Articles Written by the Contemporaries of Ellen G. White* (Washington, DC: The Ellen G. White Estate, 1961); Herbert E. Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord: The Prophetic Ministry of Ellen G. White* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 1998); Theodore N. Levterov, "The Development of the Seventh-day Adventist Understanding of Ellen G. White's Prophetic Gift, 1844–1889," (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2011); Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon, eds., *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2014).

[6]Much of their work is available today in digital format from the Ellen G. White Estate: http://ellenwhite.org.

[7]Adventist Family Ministries, "Home," http://family.adventist.org.

raised in this discussion is whether the teachings of the church, particularly Ellen White's teachings about marriage, are consistent with the Whites' own marital experiences. In this sense, the subject is relevant for Adventists and those interested in the church's history.

Previous studies on the Whites' family life that were examined within the limits of this investigation did not take a contextualized psychological approach, but were limited to theological-historical interpretation.[8] Therefore, we believe that a psychological analysis can contribute to a new perspective on the topic. In this study we will question the meanings of the Whites' marriage, built by the couple themselves, taken mainly from documents produced by them.

The Concept of Marriage or Conjugal Union

Marriage has been described in the literature as an interactional process of building a common reality that constitutes the opposite of individuality, intended to last a lifetime.[9] This relationship is built through verbal exchanges, aiming at a shared history; a change in the agenda of one spouse inevitably affects the other.[10]

Kurt Lewin describes the marital relationship as a group situation of two people, and the most demanding of all situations of this type.[11] Several reasons are cited by Lewin: marriage demands more profound and lasting dedication than any other human group and, moreover, covers all aspects of life without admitting interference in its dynamics. Thus, marriage is a human grouping with extremely low tolerance to external interventions and involves desire and the expectation of reciprocal access and intimate exposure.

Lewin also draws attention to the fact that a marital group, like any other, is not the mere sum of its parts, because it has its own structure, goals, and dynamics, even when in relationship with other groups, which requires individual adjustment to the groups' demands. The essence of a group is not the similarity or the difference between its members, but their interdependence, which can vary from a firm cohesion to a fragile relationship. In this sense, the

[8]Ronald D. Graybill, "The Power of Prophecy: Ellen G. White and the Women Religious Founders of the Nineteenth Century" (PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1983); A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, vols. 1–3; Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord*; George R. Knight, *Meeting Ellen White: A Fresh Look at Her Life, Writings, and Major Themes* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1996); idem, *Walking with Ellen White: The Human Interest Story* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1999); Robinson, *James White*; Wheeler, *James White*.

[9]John Witte, Jr., *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion, and Law in the Western Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), passim.

[10]Terezinha Féres-Carneiro and Orestes Diniz-Neto, "De Onde Viemos? Uma Revisão Histórico Conceitual da Psicoterapia de Casal," *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa* 24.4 (2008): 487–496.

[11]Kurt Lewin, "The Background of Conflict in Marriage," in *Resolving Social Conflicts: Selected Papers in Group Dynamics*, ed. Gertrude Weiss Lewin (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), 84–102. The following discussion is based on these pages by Lewin.

differences or similarities are only important to the extent that they meet the group's needs as a whole and those of its members in particular.

Still, according to Lewin, the group supports the individuals within it, and their position and security depend on how accepted they feel by the group. Any change in the group will affect its members, and any change in one of its members affects the group. Thus, if an individual's participation is not well established in the group, the group may become unstable. This applies most acutely to conjugal groups.

For Lewin, participation in a group complies with principles of necessity for both the group and the individual. Participation in a group requires a variable measure of submission to group needs, but there must be enough freedom for each person to meet their own needs as well. If those needs are not met, tension will arise, and the person will be unhappy. As this unhappiness becomes more intense, it may cause the person to leave the group or want to destroy it.

From the point of view of meeting individual and group needs, Lewin points out that adjustment to a group depends on three factors: (1) the character of the group, (2) the individual's character and individual characteristics, including the amount of freedom they need, and (3) the position the individual occupies in the group. The reconciliation of these factors depends on whether the group's leadership is autocratic or democratic, with different results for the group and its members. The adoption of autocratic leadership tends to produce tense, insecure individuals without initiative; discourage creativity; and, among other negative effects, according to Lewin, produce much greater tension and lead members of the group to apathy or aggression.

Democratic leadership, on the other hand, generally leads to greater interaction; stimulates creativity, initiative, and advancement of members; eases tensions; and produces safety in the group. It provides an open channel between the leader and the led to speak frankly, both in symbolic exchanges of everyday life and in conflict resolution. Democratic relations are directly linked to the atmosphere, another important element in the group, on top of the ability to meet needs. This atmosphere, along with the level of freedom, may be a decisive factor in the resolution of problems and conflicts, especially in marital relations.

Thus, causes of tension can be described as (1) the degree of need or need satisfaction, (2) the amount of freedom, (3) external barriers that prevent withdrawing from the environment when there is tension to avoid more suffering and conflict, and (4) conflict between the goals of group members or refusal to consider others' point of view. Several other issues related to the functioning of a marital group have the potential to generate conflict: (1) unmet expectations of one spouse in relation to the other, (2) an accentuated and continuous state of lack of attention or hypersatiation, and (3) a difference in the couple's sexual expectations. These issues can be balanced by placing a high priority on maintaining the marriage. Another important element that can generate or minimize conflict is the meaning that marriage has for its members. Depending on this meaning, marriage can facilitate the achievement of goals or become a barrier to them.

Another element that may produce conflict is nesting of groups. Other groups, like church, work, or family, can compete with or become more important than the marriage itself, leading to jealousy. This feeling can be produced by the presence of a third person who interferes in the conjugal relationship, but can also be due to other groups occupying the attention of either spouse.

Theoretical Aspects

Two theoreticians were used in this research. First, for analysis of meanings, the proposal of Lev Vygotsky was adopted—namely that the meaning present in the unit of analysis constitutes testable empirical data to access the individual human being and their relations, since the individual and the collectivity are a social construction. In this analysis of the Whites' marriage and couple relationship, the theoretical reference sees, at the psychological level, the individual and society as mutually constituted within the historical process.[12] Thus, as an appropriate theoretical framework, this study adopts the cultural-historical perspective developed by Vygotsky and his collaborators.[13]

Second, the concept of family as a group from Lewin, one of the pioneers of social psychology, was adopted in this work, as mentioned above. His

[12]The theoretical adoption of the human individual and/or collective as a social construction in this text serves only as a research method, considering the imperfect world in which we live. The human being and the institution of marriage from the point of view of the adopted theory, are psychologically and socially under constant movement and cultural-historical mutation, which can also be attested in the biblical account, but unfortunately, not always towards the ideal indicated in Scriptures. Sociology and psychology do not necessarily need to contradict the Scriptures.

[13]The cultural-historical psychological theory was developed by the Russian psychologists Lev Semyonovich Vygotsky (1896–1934) and Alexander Romanovich Luria (1902–1977). Vygotsky argued that the capacity for signification through the ability of making meaning by the use of signs (words) is the distinctive quality of the human beings. Consciousness (or self-consciousness), according to Vygotsky, is constituted historically and culturally in a dialectic process mediated by the meaning present in the sign; therefore, "thinking and speech are the key to understanding the nature of human consciousness," thus "the word is the most direct manifestation of the historical nature of human consciousness" (L. S. Vygotsky, "Thinking and Speech," in *The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky*, vol. 1 of *Problems of General Psychology*, eds. R. W. Rieber and A. S. Carton [New York: Plenum Press, 1987], 285). For a comprehensive exposition of this theory see Anton Yasnitsky, René van der Veer, and Michel Ferrari, eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of Cultural-Historical Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); see also James V. Wertsch, *Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), and Ronald Miller, *Vygotsky in Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013). This research, however, does not endorse all ideological assumptions culturally accepted by Vygotsky. The cultural-historical theory can grasp only the human reality after sin and cannot replace revelation or explain the operation of the Holy Spirit. For a better understanding of Vygotsky and his contribution see: René van der Veer and Jaan Valsiner, *Understanding Vygotsky: A Quest for Syntesis* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), particularly chapter 16, "Criticisms."

theoretical proposal has been interpreted erroneously as static. Further studies indicated that a more accurate reading of Lewin revealed the presence of a dynamic interation between individuals. However, the dynamic relationships of the group, similar to proposals in various systemic aspects, were expanded after the work of Urie Bronfenbrenner and Pamela Morris in what was called the bioecological theory of human development.[14]

According to Vygotsky,[15] throughout individual existence, the use of signs and their meanings provides a relational situation between humans through speech, in its various manifestations, which plays a central role in social relations. In this theoretical framework, the emergence of conscious thought follows the human construction of a social and semiotic world that becomes a specific part of the human environment. This world is appropriated and internalized, and gradually transforms the primary psyche into conscious thought. In this sense, the constitution of the mind is the internalization of social meanings; hence individual and society are inextricably linked, and the mind and the social world accessible through socially shared meanings by speech.[16]

Therefore, the meaning of the word appears as a "unit of analysis of the relationship historically made between thought and language."[17] However, the multiple meanings depend on the situations, positions, and ways of participation of the subjects in the relationship. That is, when it comes to behavior and experience, the marital meanings present in the speeches and the cultural context of the Whites and their practices, from the available documents, constitute material for analysis, referenced in theory, which can provide a scientific view of the meanings present in the consciousness of the individual that are constructed and collectively shared through these practices.

In this sense, representing consciousness, the speeches and practices with their meanings and the social context cannot be underestimated, because they point to the individual's own constitution. Therefore, through the meanings

[14]See Urie Bronfenbrenner and Pamela Morris, "The Ecology of Developmental Processes," in *Handbook of Child Psychology*, vol. 1 of *Theoretical Models of Human Development*, ed. William Damon and Richard M. Lerner, 5th ed. (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1998), 993–1028; or idem, "The Bioecological Model of Human Development," in ibid., 6th ed. (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons, 2006), 793–828.

[15]Lev S. Vygotsky, *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), passim. Scientific theories are subject to improvements, particularly in the humanities, but in general, some resistance to Vygotsky, particularly in the West, is often due to his critics being unaware of his theoretical proposal. Although there are discussions on this and other psychological theories, the cultural-historical theory is accepted and used in researches around the world having their findings been successfully replicated in many studies, and theoretical analysis of different authors.

[16]Demóstenes Neves da Silva, "Significações de Pais e Professores sobre a Relação Família-Escola: As Armadilhas de um (des)encontro" (PhD diss., Universidade Federal da Bahia, 2014), 59–68.

[17]João Paulo P. Barros et. al, "O Conceito de 'Sentido' in Vygotsky: Considerações Epistemológicas e suas Implicações para a Investigação Psicológica," *Psicologia & Sociedade* 21.2 (May/August 2009): 174–181. Translated by the authors.

present in the documents that contain their speeches, one can analyze the Whites' experiences of their marital relationship and their daily practices.

Methodology

The conception of the human being as the subject of thought and one that creates meaning and sense in social relations, as indicated in the theoretical purpose of this study, points to a qualitative methodological approach that values contextual and interpretative aspects of the research.

This work is a qualitative case study based on the analysis of documents written by the Whites, especially, but not exclusively, private correspondence, available at the Ellen G. White Estate website. The main documents on which the analysis is based are those related to their marriage and its crises, particularly from 1874 to 1876. That period was marked by James's poor health from the effects of the strokes he suffered in previous years, and fatigue on the part of Ellen White as James's caregiver.[18]

The letters used in this research show clearly expressed ideas by James and Ellen, with no indications of inability to write, despite James's illness. The content of this material expresses the symbolic universe related to their marital life. It shows the type of relationship they lived and how the couple handled their stresses and subsequent reconciliatory actions.

Furthermore, this set of documents was produced by the couple without the expectation of publication, being of a private nature, and thus does not present evidence of speech that is merely laudatory or aimed at providing social satisfaction. Thus, the material offers the opportunity to identify the constituent meanings of awareness of those involved and their practices, and

[18]Part of the letters written by the Whites during that period and a brief historical-contextual analysis appears in an appendix in E. G. White, *Daughters of God: Messages Especially for Women* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2005), 260–273; and A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:424–445. James suffered his first stroke on 16 August 1865 ([Uriah Smith], "Sickness of Bro. White," *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 26.12 [1865]: 96 [Future references to the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* will be abbreviated with *RH*]; J. White, "My Condition," *RH* 26.23 [1865]: 180; E. G. White, *Life Sketches*, 168–169; idem, "Our Late Experience," *RH* 27.12 [1866]: 89; William C. White, "Sketches and Memories of James and Ellen G. White," *RH* 114.1 [1937]: 10–12; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White* 2:118–119). In 1873 (April and May), he suffered two other strokes (Robinson, *James White*, 241; cf. J. W[hite], "Permanency of the Cause," *RH* 42.4 [1873]: 29). Some state that the 1873 strokes were the fourth and fifth ones (cf. Jerry Moon and Denis Kaiser, "For Jesus and Scripture: The Life of Ellen G. White," *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, 48). In 1879, James stated that since he had begun preaching the gospel, his life had "been a life of toil, care, perplexity, and sickness much of the time." He also added that three times his "nervous system" had "been shocked . . . with paralysis, and three times the arm that traces these lines has fallen, for a time to be raised and moved only by the other." According to him, all of these strokes "usually occurred after severe mental strain" (J. W[hite], "Grow Old Gracefully," *RH* 53.20 [1879]: 156). In 1881, in the last days of his life, he suffered another stroke; according to Dr. Kellogg, had he survived this one, "his mind would [have been] permanently enfeebled" (Robinson, *James White*, 297, 299).

is useful to identify and analyze the meanings constructed in the private and marital life of the Whites.

The document analysis in this study uses the method proposed by Laurence Bardin, called content analysis, based on the Lewin family concept. Content analysis can be "defined as an operation or set of operations aimed to represent the contents of a document under a different form of the original in order to facilitate, at a later state, its consultation and referral."[19]

In qualitative research, document analysis aims to provide a convenient form and represent this information (raw data) with maximum relevance, and to form a preliminary database (representation of raw data) for further analysis of the content. This is done by manipulating the messages contained in the documents to highlight thematic or frequent indicators that suggest meanings different from the raw data, according to the research objective.[20]

The documents used in this study constitute a revealing record of individual practices as well as collective and cultural practices of the time that were significant for individuals involved. In this investigation, the chosen documents were consulted in an effort to understand the marital relationship, corroborated by the historical context of the time, as described by other researchers of the subject.

After finding and examining the data, the units of analysis were organized in thematic blocks constituting broader categories. These categories were then analyzed from the perspective of cultural-historical psychology, taking as the main reference the concept of marriage as a group situation, proposed by Lewin.[21]

To understand the marital relationship of the Whites in the context of the nineteenth century, we have adopted the following objectives: (1) to describe and analyze the meanings and practices of the marital relationship of the Whites present in the documents they produced, and (2) to identify consistencies or inconsistencies between speech and practice with regard to their marrriage.

The limitations of this research are linked to conditions of time and space that prevent a more detailed analysis of both the data used in this research and the other documents available, but not utilized in the study. However, in addition to the results already presented, this work's methodology and theoretical framework are useful for the investigation of the objectives as key themes to be expanded on later.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The examination of the documents allowed the construction of data sets that, according to the research objectives, were organized into three broad, thematic blocks or categories. To address the specificities of these thematic blocks, sub-themes were developed for each of them. The general themes are:

[19]Laurence Bardin, *L'Analyse de Contenu* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1977), 45; idem, *Análise de Conteúdo* (Lisboa: Edições 70, 1977), 45.

[20]Ibid., passim.

[21]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 84–102.

(1) the dominant meaning of the Whites' marriage, (2) barriers in the relationship, and (3) the promoting factors or potential promoters of the relationship. We will continue now to the analysis of each thematic block with its subtopics.

The Dominant Meaning of the Whites' Marriage

In this thematic block we highlighted two sub-themes: (1) dealing with what the marriage of the Whites was not and (2) the marriage of James and Ellen as a union whose dominant meaning was compliance with the mission.

The Lack of Romantic Love

The Victorian era in which James and Ellen lived was characterized by the typical morality of the time, which expected a woman to live a life of obedience to her husband, emphasizing private and public modesty, purity, and piety.[22] In the United States during the pre-Civil War era, what was known to its detractors as the "cult of domesticity" or "cult of true womanhood" prevailed among the Anglo-American upper and middle class, which contrasted the home with the world and idealized it as a shelter built by a wife and mother for her husband and children; the most valuable thing for these women was the education of their children to be valuable citizens.[23] However, at that time, the rules were different when it came to private and intimate life.

According to Lystra's in-depth study of Victorian behavior, it was acknowledged that there was more openness and honesty in private behavior in the United States during the nineteenth century. Thus, the widespread notion of that century as a time when communication during courtship and marriage was conducted in a distant and formal style is at odds with the content of the letters and the recommendations in love manuals of the time.[24]

The introductions of love letters in the United States in the nineteenth century, as described by Lystra, indicated the level of intimacy between the correspondents. The "pet names" or nicknames used were clear emblems of the privileged relationship, stated in the initial greetings and farewells of letters and cards.[25] Introductory phrases such as "Dear Pet Baby Wife," "My Darling Precious Wife," "My Darling Chikey," "My Little Darling Wife," "Dear Dovey," and "My Dear Darling Chick" were common. The conclusions used "Your No-No," "Your Pussy," and "Devotedly Your Own," among other equally flirtatious phrases. And, although the language of emotions was sometimes conventional, the images drawn presented details of the emotional

[22]Karen Lystra, *Searching the Heart: Women, Men, and Romantic Love in Nineteenth Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[23]Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820–1860," *American Quarterly* 18.2 (1966): 151–174; republished in idem, *Dimity Convictions: The American Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1976), 21–41; cf. Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), passim.

[24]Lystra, *Searching the Heart*, 12–27.

[25]Ibid.

condition of both parties, especially the women. Therefore, according to the author, love letters of the time were not formal, but very expressive and free in showing affection, from "business to sex."[26] Also, the choice of a spouse[27] based on love was already part of the conditions for marriage around 1830.[28]

Thus, the absence of elaborate expressions of love and affection in the private letters between James and Ellen indicates a marriage without the romantic features of their time. In the letters analyzed, for example, the introduction phrase Ellen uses for her spouse is "Dear husband," and for Lucinda Hall, her assistant, "Dear sister Lucinda,"[29] and "Dear Lucinda."[30]

In the conclusions of the letters from Ellen to James, the expressions are "Yours in love,"[31] and "In much love to yourself and Lucinda, I remain, Yours affectionately."[32] "Your Ellen," "In Love," and "In much love I remain, Your Ellen" are also used by Ellen,[33] but these expressions do not point to a relationship centered in romance. First, because the letters lack loving content centered on marital intimate affections: the predominant themes in the letters

[26]Ibid., 19.

[27]Though parental guidance was important, the freedom in the choosing of a partner as the basis to form a new family is visible at that time (Carl N. Degler, *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1980], 8–19; E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* [New York: Basic Books, 1993], 109–119).

[28]Ellen White corroborates this thought. A few years later she said: "Marriage is something that will influence and affect your life, both in this world, and in the world to come. A sincere Christian will not advance his plans in this direction without the knowledge that God approves his course. He will not want to choose for himself, but will feel that God must choose for him. We are not to please ourselves, for Christ pleased not himself. I would not be understood to mean that any one is to marry one whom he does not love. This would be sin. But fancy and the emotional nature must not be allowed to lead on to ruin" (E. G. White, "Marrying and Giving in Marriage," *RH*, 65.39 [1888]: 610; idem, *The Adventist Home: Counsels to Seventh-day Adventist Families as Set Forth in the Writings of Ellen G. White* [Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1952], 43; cf. idem to Dear Brother Albert, 23 September 1886 [Letter 23, 1886], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1).

[29]E.g. E. G. White to Dear Sister Lucinda, 6 April 1876 (Letter 58, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; idem to Dear Sister Lucinda, 8 April 1876 (Letter 59, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD.

[30]E.g. idem to Dear Lucinda, 20 April 1876 (Letter 60, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; idem to Dear Lucinda, 27 April 1876 (Letter 61, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD.

[31]E.g. idem to Dear Husband, 16 May 1876 (Letter 27, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD.

[32]Idem to Dear Husband, 4 April 1876 (Letter 3, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD.

[33]See for example the letters quoted in A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:434, 437, 439.

analyzed are work, mission, duty, camp meetings, publishers, problems in the brotherhood, and religious themes. Second, Ellen used similar expressions to address assistants, fellow church members, friends, and family, such as "Much love to yourself and my husband," "In love to all the Family," "Love to yourself and Mary Chase and all friends," "Your wife, whom I love and respect in the Lord," and "I love you, and I want to see you in a position where you can best serve the Master,"[34] among others.

Despite expressions of affection and mutual care, especially on the part of Ellen, the private letters lack the central theme of mutual passion, even in a time of great emotional need, during the crisis of James's disease. In this situation, one would expect the various letters to contain expressions of support, intimacy, and conjugal love, but, in general, the expressions in the letters of Ellen and James could also be used for a close relative like a child, father, or mother.

Some reasons can be inferred for the formality, or lack of romantic affection, in this private correspondence between spouses. First, it could be suggested that this situation was due to the critical stage of James's disease. However, no warm and intimate expressions typical of married life were found in their writings from other periods of their marriage; there are formal declarations of affection, but they are not romantic in the style of the time.

Another reason could be the chronological phase or absence of marital eroticism. However, the denial of sexuality, sexual coldness, or withdrawal did not appear in any accessible document as a unit to be analyzed. Marital sexual satisfaction constitutes a complex element and therefore cannot be universally standardized, which makes it impossible to form any serious judgment based on facts about the Whites' intimate life. From Lewin's perspective, this complexity within each conjugal group involves individual, differentiated demands of those involved, necessitating adjustment to the dynamics and arrangements of the group.[35] Moreover, the internal and external requirements for a marriage are different throughout life, such as in the presence or absence of children and in different states of health.

Another factor that relativizes conceptions, expectations, and sexual practices, particularly in marriage, refers to the very constitution of the human being that, according to Vygotsky, happens historically and socially. Accordingly, in addition to Lewin's observation that demands and expectations vary from couple to couple in the same environment, one can conclude from Vygostky that the concept and experience of acceptable sexuality for certain couples, in a certain culture, and in a particular point in time can be seen as inappropriate for other cultures or periods of time.

[34]E.g., E. G. White, Letter 59, 1876; idem to Dear Sister Lucinda, 8 October 1874 (Letter 70, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; idem to Dear Husband, 11 April 1876 (Letter 5, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; idem to Dear Brother and Sister [E. P.] Daniells, April 1888 (Letter 10, 1888), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 4; idem to Dear Sister Peck, 15 September 1905 (Letter 265, 1905), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1.

[35]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 92–93.

Therefore, it cannot be considered scientific practice to issue a judgment or venture any opinion without objective data for analysis—let alone from the call for "imagination," a word used by Ronald Numbers for his argument in which he points to the coolness of Ellen as causing or aggravating their marriage conflicts. This lack of solid data is repeated when Numbers implies that the condemnation of sexual "excess"[36] in Ellen's writings relates to an alleged apathy in her marital intimate life.[37] Available data does not point to the age factor or to sexual problems as elements generating tension in their relations, so these possibilities should be treated as speculation.

In addition, both seemed generally satisfied with their relationship, and there is no evidence indicating complaints regarding their sexual life or related to their age. The existence of offspring points to a married life with productive sexuality, independent of frequency or the use of separate bedrooms, which was due to Ellen's habit of getting up very early in the mornings to write.[38]

[36]Often the theme of "excess" or "intemperance of every kind" (E. G. White, *Selected Messages* [Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1980], 3:280) appears in the writings of Ellen White concerning many aspects of life. For example: eating and drinking (cf. idem, *Christian Temperance and Bible Hygiene* [Battle Creek, MI: Good Health, 1890], 12; idem, *The Adventist Home*, 121; idem, *The Ministry of Healing* [Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1905], 306); dressing (cf. idem, *Christian Temperance*, 12); working (cf. idem, *Christian Temperance*, 98–99); studying and amusement (cf. idem, "Our Children—Importance of Early Training," *Health Reformer* 13.2 [1878]: 44); physical exercise (idem, *Messages to Young People* [Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1930], 179); and "any excesses" of married lives (idem, *Testimonies for the Church* [Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1948], 2:472), among several similar references.

[37]Ronald L. Numbers, "Sex, Science, and Salvation: The Sexual Advice of Ellen G. White and John Harvey Kellogg," in *Right Living: An Anglo-American Tradition of Self-Help, Medicine and Hygiene*, ed. Charles E. Rosenberg [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003], 206–226). Numbers states, "One can only imagine how he [James] felt about Ellen's coolness toward sex and her heartfelt condemnations of marital 'excess.' . . . She remained generally antipathetic toward sex, though she always stopped short of advocating celibacy" (Ibid., 212; idem, *Prophetess of Health: A Study of Ellen G. White*, 3rd ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 217). Numbers's conclusions contradict Ellen's own statements that, though living in a time when restraint was exercised in speaking or writing about sex, she wrote some words about the "privilege of the married life" and that "Jesus did not enforce celibacy upon any class of men" (E. G. White, *The Adventist Home*, 121–122; see Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord*, 105–106). Numbers's analysis, therefore, is devoid of data and an insinuation about the intimate lives of the Whites. A response was given to the claims of Numbers in 1976, when he published the first edition of his book (Numbers, *A Critique of the Book Prophetess of Health* [Washington, DC: Ellen G. White Estate, 1976], 15, 71–74).

[38]The first house built by the Whites in 1856 had separate bedrooms for James and Ellen, and in some of the other houses they later built or purchased followed the same pattern (Wheeler, *James White*, 90). Separate bedrooms were not a general custom of the time, although some followed this custom in the Victorian age (Judith Flanders, *Inside the Victorian Home: A Portrait of Domestic Life in Victorian England* [New York: W. W. Norton, 2004], 38). James worked hard during the day in administrative

On the other hand, the absence of intimate sexual references in their private letters may indicate that the subject did not occupy the first place in the couple's agenda.[39] The fact is that no data is available in the analyzed materials that register complaints from the Whites on that subject during any stage of their married life.

The Mission as the Main Meaning

The analysis of the Whites' context and letters points to a marriage guided by their sense of mission and love for the cause. In the relationship they developed, they "both knew from the outset that their marriage would not be the typical Victorian arrangement in which the wife was expected only to care for children, nurture her husband, and physically maintain the home."[40] So, the couple united due to the mission context and to accomplish the mission.[41]

occupations that involved making important decisions. This required him to have a good night's sleep, while Ellen woke up during the night or early in the morning to write. The most convenient option for both to lead an efficient and industrious life was adopting separate rooms to sleep. This does not seem to demonstrate a relationship problem between them. Examples of their good relationship are shown in some statements of Ellen's. In 1860, she lovingly wrote to James, "You may be assured I miss your little visits in my room" (E. [G. White] to Dear husband, 12 October 1860 [Letter 10, 1860], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1 [quoted in A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 1:426]). On another occasion, she said that, when traveling, she preferred sleeping alone to sharing space with other women, except her friend Lucinda, and said about James, "I prize my being all to myself unless graced with your presence. I want to share my bed only with you" (idem to Dear Husband, 13 April 1876 [Letter 6, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1). The couple also had a custom of spending time chatting on some nights before going to sleep (idem, "Christ and the Law," 19 June 1889 [Manuscript 5, 1899], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 10).

[39]Though the Whites lived and worked in a time "of great restraint toward speaking publicly or writing of sex and the sexual relationship between husbands and wives," Ellen, "an ardent advocate of a high standard of purity and holiness," condemned "extreme positions in the matter of the relation of husbands and wives." In her thoughts about the "privilege of the marriage relation" she always condemned both extremes: (1) "sexual excess" or (2) a life of continence in order to reach a higher spiritual level. She pleaded for a moderate course as appropriate for the Christian believer (A. L. White, "Ellen G. White and Marriage Relations," *Ministry* 42.3 [1969]: 6–8, 26–27; ibid., 42.4 [1969]: 19–21, 23; cf. E. G. White, *Mind, Character and Personality* [Silver Spring, MD: Ellen G. White Publications, 1977], 1:218–239; Miroslav M. Kiš, "Sexuality," *Ellen G. White Encyclopedia,* 1155–1157; Leonard Brand and Don S. McMahon, *The Prophet and Her Critics: A Striking New Analysis Refutes the Charges that Ellen G. White "Borrowed" the Health Message* [Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2005], 80–86; Ingemar Lindén, *The Last Trump: An Historico-genetical Study of Some Important Chapters in the Making and Development of the Seventh-day Adventist Church* [Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1978], 270–278).

[40]Graybill, "The Power of Prophecy," 5; cf. Degler, *At Odds*, 8–9, 26.

[41]Circumstances and the "great work" led James to ponder that they "could greatly assist each other in that work." "As she should come before the public," reasoned

The mission occupies a central position in the content of the analyzed letters. The terms "duty," "work," "cause," "mission," and the like appear more than seventy times in one set of letters,[42] and much of the other correspondence between Ellen and James centers on issues related to work. Even expressions of mutual attention, the desire for James's recovery, or marital conflict are almost always connected to work. These references indicate that the Whites did not experience their marriage as a romantic love relationship in the nineteenth-century style, but functioned as a working group (Lewin) to serve Jesus until He returned and the mission was accomplished.[43] However, despite the centrality of work, the letters clearly show James and Ellen expressing caring and devoted mutual concern:

> My husband is very attentive to me, seeking in every way to make my journeyings and labor pleasant and relieve it of weariness. He is very cheerful and of good courage.[44]
>
> We were very glad to receive [the] postal that you had arrived safe at your journey's end. We have not forgotten to pray for you. Every day we asked our heavenly Father to guard you, bless and strengthen you. [45]
>
> I miss you and would love to be with you if this was the will of God.[46]
>
> I love my family and nothing but a sense of duty can separate me from them.[47]

They had no time or thought for romantic love, because it was not attractive to them. This picture may have seemed dull to the teenagers of their time or to those focused on pleasures and achievements in marriage. But, while the intrinsic marital projects of the couple are legitimate, Ellen

---

James, "she needed a lawful protector, and God having chosen her as a channel of light and truth to the people in a special sense, she could be of great help to" him (J. White and E. G. White, *Life Sketches* [1880], 126, cf. 238; E. G. White, "Interview with Mrs. E. G. White Regarding Early Experiences," 13 August 1906 [Manuscript 131, 1906], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 6). Ellen clearly stated that their "hearts were united in the great work" (idem, *Testimonies*, 1:75; idem, *Life Sketches* [1915], 97).

[42]Those that appear in idem, *Daughters of God*, 260–275; and A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:424–445.

[43]This experience and compromise did not exclude affection, sympathy, or feeling good being together. With proximity and commonality in the mission, they developed admiration, respect, and love for each other ("White, Ellen Gould [Harmon]" *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, ed. Don F. Neufeld [Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1996], 874).

[44][E. G. White] to Dear Sister Lucinda, 17 June 1875 (Letter 46, 1875), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2; idem, *Daughters of God*, 261.

[45]Idem, Letter 3, 1876, 2.

[46]Idem to Dear Husband, 20 April 1876 (Letter 11, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2.

[47]J. White to My Dear Ellen, 1 November 1860, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 1:427.

and James were experiencing something more. The symbolic universe of the couple indicates a clear commitment to their religious life, and they did not seem to know how to live otherwise.

The meanings present in the units of analysis of James and Ellen's letters can be difficult to understand for the romantic generation raised on "liquid love," as described by Zygmunt Bauman, which is of uncanny frailty, with no permanent or durable bonds, and primarily self-centered.[48] The meanings of the Whites' love have, as their organizing center, a mission that they both embraced. Theirs can be described as a marriage in service to that great mission, as these lines below demonstrate:

> Let us pray each day in faith, not only for health, but to be imbued with the Spirit of God that we may do the work committed to our trust to His acceptance. This is what I live for. I have no other ambition.[49]
>
> I so desire that you may have a clear and cheerful mind to do the will of God. A great work is before us that others cannot do. Our experience is of value to this cause. [50]
>
> Mine has been a peculiar work. It was my duty to stand by the side of Mrs. White in her work of delivering the reproofs of the Lord.[51]
>
> [E]specially when Mrs. White and I pray by ourselves, [These moments] are very precious. . . . We see a great work to be done, and we believe that God will raise us up to bear some part in it.[52]
>
> The work is moving everywhere. . . . We are able to accomplish thrice the amount of labor at present that we have been able to do at any time during the past three years. And Mrs. White comes from the excessive labors of the past season with better health, and courage, than at any time in her life. God is good. He helps those who are willing to wear out, and lets those have their way who choose to rust out.[53]

This kind of experience is peculiar to this couple. The Whites' marriage was not bourgeois or overtly romantic (based on feeling and passion), Malthusian (based on capitalist reasons), contemporary (with individualistic morality or just for fun), or under any other label. However, in the couple's own perception, their marriage was one of mutual love, made possible by

[48]Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003), passim.

[49]E. G. White to Dear Husband, 11 July 1874 (Letter 41, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 3; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:439.

[50]E. [G. White] to Dear Husband, 15 July 1874 (Letter 43, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 3.

[51]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal to the Ministry and the People* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, 1873), 6; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:427.

[52]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 11–12; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:429. The statement clearly presents James's hope of recovering and working together with his wife again.

[53]J. W[hite], "The Signs of the Times," *RH* 44.19 (1874): 152; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:457.

the divine providence that chose James to stand alongside and support the messenger of God in the transmission of their messages.

At the beginning of their family life (a time of many financial difficulties for the couple), during the "early history of the [Adventist] cause," James admitted that they had to work hard and lived in strict economy, wearing "poor clothing" and suffering "for want of proper food," as well as trying to find means to invest in the propagation of the gospel.[54] Providence placed alongside Ellen someone to complement her and help her to satisfactorily fulfill her task. The meanings of words in their private correspondence are directly opposed to the contemporary goals of the existentialist or romantic mentalities of nineteenth-century culture.

Theoretically, the concept of *living experience*, presented by Vygotski, refers to a unique experience that cannot be replicated in another's life, even someone living in the same time period. This is simply because it is an experience of that moment, of those people, with interactions and ways to relate to the world that surround them through social practices.[55]

So, while they were a typical nineteenth-century couple in many aspects, the singular experience of the Whites and their speeches and practices show a unique worldview built on relations with the Adventist movement and the prophetic gift, in the certainty that their divine mission would take them to the soon return of Jesus. Because of this worldview, they lived their marriage as consecrated to the mission. This is the living experience of the Whites that cannot be analyzed outside of this universe, unique to the couple, their immediate context, and their contemporaries who shared the same ideals.

Also, in this theoretical framework, consistency between practice and meaning creates individual or group coherence. In this sense, biographical or autobiographical data from the couple's life, when compared with the meanings present in the material analyzed, point to practices being consistent with speeches in their marriage group.

Thus, when considering the theological aspect of the question, the experience of James and Ellen, reflected in the feeling of teamwork and their focus on the mission, presents itself as the most coherent and sensible course of married life, particularly in its practical contempt for the romanticism of their time. Who, after all, in good conscience, having direct communication with the Almighty, and receiving from Him the mission to warn the world because the Savior is about to come, could fail to put the mission first, without being inconsistent with such a privilege and his own belief?

In the above sense, the marriage of the Whites may seem anachronistic, but even in the face of James's crisis, the divergent opinions between him

[54]J. W[hite], "Present and Future," *RH* 56.14 (1880): 216; cf. J. W[hite], "Our Missions," *RH* 55.6 (1880): 88; J. White and E. G. White, *Life Sketches* (1880), 129, 242–44; [E. G. White], "European General Council," 21 September 1885 (Manuscript 19, 1885), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1–5; J. White, *Life Incidents*, 274; E. G. White, *Spiritual Gifts*, 2:94.

[55]Ana Luiza Bustamante Smolka, "O (im)próprio e o (im)pertinente na Apropriação das Práticas Sociais," *Cadernos Cedes* 22.50 (April 2000): 26–40.

and Ellen, or their renunciation of a home life with their children, the couple never lost sight of the sovereign reason that united them. At no time or place did their marriage become incoherent or inconsistent with its central and unique reference of life.[56] Their sense of teamwork worked as a strengthening element of the marital bond.

These indicators in the lives of the Whites do not allow the researcher, from the data present in the documents, to consider their marriage empty or meaningless. Rather, the data points to an intense union with a mission, its greatest risk being their extreme involvement with each other and their mission, leading to one or both abandoning or destroying the group by an excess of activity leading to "oversatiation."[57] However, also in this regard, James and Ellen's efforts were well defined and objective, always working to harmonize their marriage and their mission.

It is clear, therefore, that the love of James and Ellen did not fit the concept of romantic love of the nineteenth century, although the data indicates affection, attention, mutual care, productive sexuality, and lifelong marital fidelity. Their relationship contained solid couple elements and was independent of the traditional concept of romantic love, which is a transient social construction. Their relationship, as shown in the data, was focused on the mission as its dominant meaning, but this was not exclusive of other meanings. In addition, they had a sense of teamwork with clear, concrete, and achievable goals, working as an element that strengthened and gave meaning to the union—an element in the lives of successful couples, as pointed out by Lewin.[58]

On the other hand, work, when interwoven with marriage, can conspire against the marriage, since it can take priority over the needs of a member or work against the dynamics of the marriage. This issue will be addressed in the next section, which deals with barriers present in the Whites' marriage.

Barriers in the Marital Relationship of the Whites

James's Personality and His Disease

Two of the barriers in the Whites' marital relationship are connected to James, namely his personality and disease. At first glance, James's problem could be

[56]As can be seen in the literature produced by the couple, it was never easy for them to leave their children in the care of others to dedicate themselves to the itinerant service of preaching and visiting. Ellen said that of the many difficulties and sacrifices involved in the mission, "the greatest sacrifice I was called to make in connection with the work was to leave my children to the care of others" (E. G. White, *Testimonies*, 1:101; cf. 1:87, 581; idem, *Spiritual Gifts*, 2:107–108; idem to My Dear Children, 20 September 1859 (Letter 23, 1859), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; J. White to Dear Brother and Sister in Port Gibson, [NY], 26 August 1848, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; J. White, *Life Incidents*, 293; J. White and E. G. White, *Life Sketches* [1880], 243–244, 254–255).

[57]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 92.

[58]Ibid.

regarded as arising directly and exclusively from post-stroke consequences,[59] suggesting an exclusively organic-medical origin for his aggressive, suspicious, and controlling behavior during the 1874 and 1876 crises, particularly.

However, this explanation, based on a single physical factor, is contradicted by data from James's and Ellen's speeches and the descriptions of his grandson, Arthur White. James had been building the framework for this behavior for some time, since his first contacts with warning messages about how his manner would reflect on his health,[60] as follows:

> From the time of my first acquaintance with the one whom God has chosen to speak through to His erring people up to the time of the last vision, I have been cautioned from time to time of my danger of speaking, while under the pressure of a sense of the wrongs of others, in an unguarded manner, and using words that would not have the best effect on those I reproved.[61]
>
> I have been warned to trust in God, and let Him fight my battles and vindicate my cause, and not suffer my mind to dwell upon the course of those who had injured me. But in my "peculiar trials" I have lost sight of such blessed admonitions, and have dwelt upon the wrongs of others greatly to my injury. My courage, faith, and health have suffered on the account.[62]

Thus, the disease had a circular or vicious origin: first, his behavior led to his illness, and then the stroke caused further behavior changes, which, in turn, sickened him further. In addition, to Ellen, the cause of James's illness did not "exist in reality," being a production of James's mind that affected his health and not the opposite. Ellen wrote,

> And it is not so much that I am afflicted with your distrust and suspicions of me that troubles me, but that you let it afflict you. It wears upon your health, and I am unable to remove the cause because it does not exist in reality.[63]

Ellen also attributed a spiritual meaning to the origin of James's problem:

> I cannot but feel that the enemy is making you miserable by keeping your mind upon matters that are of no profit, but only an injury. . . . Satan sees your weakness in this respect, and he will make every effort to attack you just where he has succeeded so often.[64]

Ellen pointed out that James's health depended on whether he could keep control over letting "the wrongs or supposed wrongs of others depress and dishearten" him. This situation was not merely caused by organic and physiological factors, but by the fragility of James to exercise the power of his will and resist the "temptations of the devil," as follows:

[59]E. G. White, *Daughters of God*, 260.

[60]Knight, *Walking with Ellen White*, 72.

[61]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 6; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:426–427; Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord*, 544.

[62]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 8; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:427.

[63]E. [G. White] to My dear Husband, 2 July 1874 (Letter 38, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 3; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:433–434.

[64]E. G. White to Dear Husband, 8 July 1874 (Letter 40, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 3; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:435–436.

> I want you to be happy. Your health and life depend upon your being happy and cheerful. No matter what course others pursue, this need not have such all-controlling power over your mind. Just as long as you will let the wrongs or supposed wrongs of others depress and dishearten you, you will have enough of this business to attend to.[65]

> Light, precious light . . . He [God] will let beam upon you to be imparted to others, if you will only resist the temptations of the devil to write and talk out your feelings of trial, your temptations, and your discouragements.[66]

Therefore, although the disease revealed a sharper picture of James's behavior, the documents show several contributing factors in addition to illness: overwork,[67] his tendency to dwell on the mistakes of others,[68] and his lack of will to resist evil thoughts and temptations of the devil.[69]

In addition, documents and authors used in this research describe James as exceeding at work by his zeal, taking on different roles, writing, establishing institutions, and traveling extensively, as he himself admits:

[65]Ibid., 2:435.

[66]Ibid., 2:436.

[67]Before the 1870s, James had sometimes already recognized that his frail health prevented him from continuing to work actively in the activities he accumulated as a church leader (e.g. in 1855, see A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 1:334; W. C. White, "Early Memories of Our First Home," no. 30 of "Sketches and Memories of James and Ellen G. White," *RH* 113.7 [1936]: 6–7). During that time (1855), the "anxiety of mind," added to James's burdens and labors in the office, traveling responsibilities, the death of his dear siblings (Nathaniel and Anna), and "the lack of sympathy from those who should have shared his labors," "were too much for his strength" (E. G. White, *Spiritual Gifts*, 2:194–195; idem, *Testimonies*, 1:97–98; idem to Dear Brother and Sister Loveland, 24 January 1856 [Letter 2a, 1856], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD). On several occasions, Ellen emphasized the fact that James did "the work of three men," and she "never saw a man work so energetically" and "so constantly" as James, to the point that she suggested that "God does give him more than mortal energy" (idem to Dear Willie, 17 August 1876 [Letter 39, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2; cf. idem to Dear Cousin Reed, 1870 [Letter 20, 1870], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2; idem, "Lessons from the Fifty-Eighth [Chapter] of Isaiah, 23 January 1904 [Manuscript 8, 1904], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 11; idem, "Remember the Sabbath Day, to Keep it Holy," 10 November 1906 [Manuscript 146, 1906], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2; idem to Dear Sister Belden, 26 December 1906 [Letter 396, 1906], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1–2).

[68]J. White to Dear Brother Abraham [Dodge], 31 July 1853, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1–2; E. G. White, "Extracts of Visions," July 1853 (Manuscript 5, 1853), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; cf. idem to Dear Brother and Sister Dodge, 3 August 1853 (Letter 6, 1853), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; Cf. idem, *Spiritual Gifts*, 2:194–195; J. White, "Health Reform—No. 4," *Health Reformer* 5.8 (1871): 152–153.

[69]Cf. E. G. White, "Testimony Regarding James and Ellen White," 6 June 1863 (Manuscript 1, 1863), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; W. C. White, "Sketches and Memories," *RH* 113.56 (1936): 3.

> Had I heeded these warnings as I should, I would have been able to stand against the temptations to overwork pressed upon me by my brethren, and a love to labor while seeing so much to do. And now, as the consequence, just as the field is opening as never before, and there is so much very important work to be done, I have found myself for a few weeks past unable to do anything.[70]

Thus, James worked to excess, to the point of being unable to resist "temptations to overwork." He was always looking for what remained to be done, indicating the association of two frames favorable to stress: overwork and anxiety over what to do.

Rupture, Unsatisfied Need, and Loss of Meaning

This excess involvement at work is supported by some of James's statements,[71] with the reports of his biographers, and with statements from Ellen.[72] The constant thought of *much remains to be done* must have become a greater burden even on the global scale of the challenge before him and the few who accompanied him to proclaim the threefold message deposited in the hands of the newborn church (Rev 14:6–12). So James, in that situation, suddenly found himself unable to carry out the mission that occupied the center of his personal and marital life. He suddenly suffered what Tania Zittoun calls "rupture" in his life story, and this required a response or adjustment of the body to the new situation.[73]

The process of adjustment to a new situation is called a "transition." The meanings present in the transition of James, facing the loss of his place in church business and as an inseparable partner to Ellen, were insecurity; complaints; mistrust, jealousy, and later guilt; regret for his conduct; and finally confessing his mistake—a process that unfolded until his death.[74] In this process, he struggled to return to the previous path, only to fall successively. James's trials before the rupture affected primarily the peripheral areas of his personal and marital life. But as someone addicted to work, when he was jettisoned from the process, his frame reversed to an "unsatisfied need" or "state of hunger" condition.[75]

Considering the expected reactions to unmet needs within conjugal groups, and in this case of a couple so strongly intewoven with their work, the

[70]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 8–9; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:428.

[71]E.g., J. White, "Private," 1855, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1.

[72]E.g., E. G. White to Dear Brethren and Sisters, 16 December 1854 (Letter 5, 1854), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1.

[73]Tania Zittoun, "Dynamics of Life-course Transitions: A Methodological Reflection," in *Dynamic Process Methodology in the Social and Developmental Sciences*, eds. Jaan Valsiner et al. (New York: Springer, 2009), 405–429.

[74]Cf. A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:442–445; E. G. White, *In Memorian. A Sketch of the Last Sickness and Death of Elder James White Who Died at Battle Creek, Michigan, August 6, 1881, together with the Discourse Preached at His Funeral* (Battle Creek, MI: Review & Herald, 1881), 44–50.

[75]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 89, 91–92.

"hunger" that James felt from his separation from Ellen and his responsibilities might have led him to express apathy and agression, to abandon the marital group, or to attempt to destroy it if circumstances had worsened.[76] The data indicates that James's period of dealing with his rupture, during his transition, was quite painful, marked by insecurity, complaints, desire for domination over Ellen, and jealousy that someone else was influencing her ministry in the way he understood belonged to him.

Lewin points to "the state of hunger" as a tension-generating element that, if not relieved by the individual adapting to the new conditions in the group, can lead to dissolution. In this sense, independent of James's illness, his tension and aggression, or even apathy, could have been generated by another barrier between him and his psychological goal. It would be enough that any barrier would last long enough to generate hunger and anxiety and be interpreted as impossible to remove or lasting indefinitely, which would be unbearable for him.[77]

Thus, the unusual behavior of James can be described as a coherent result of the sudden and disabling rupture and the inability to keep up with his work. Another aspect related to James's suffering is the emptiness produced because of the significance that this work had for him, as a global movement leader who was preparing the world for Jesus's return. Thus, we can see the "state of hunger" and loss of meaning in life, since the mission was the dominant meaning in their relationship and gave meaning to their existence. This emptying of meaning and "state of hunger" can help clarify the oscillation between the apathy, frustration, and aggression that served as barriers in the marital relationship.

Losses and Coherence/Consistency

James's mistrust towards others may also have been related to the loss of his exclusive position. Although he had no academic training, James's work evidences clarity and exceptional competence. This performance was a result of above average intelligence and skill at written and oral communication, described by Ellen in these words: "God has given you a good intellect—I might say a giant intellect." He had a special talent in writing and speech, described by Ellen as unique: "[N]o one can speak or write words that will sway so powerful an influence as yourself, and gladness, hope, and courage are put into all hearts."[78]

James also believed that he had a unique mission as an aid in the transmission of the prophecies: "Mine has been a peculiar work. It was my duty to stand by the side of Mrs. White in her work of delivering the reproofs of the Lord."[79] He called this mission his "peculiar work" and "duty" to, together with Ellen, deliver "the reproofs of the Lord." These meanings show

[76]Ibid., 89, 91.

[77]Ibid.

[78]E. [G. White], Letter 38, 1874, 2; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:433.

[79]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 6; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:427.

that James understood his role with Ellen to be almost irreplaceable. For him, his work was unique and sacred, since it was related to the transmission of revelations given to Ellen.[80]

Accordingly, the meanings appear to be too important and, at the same time, not transferrable. If James's work was taken away from him, whatever the reason, it would be too much for him, and the other possible candidates to accompany Ellen or counsel her would be objects of suspicion and jealousy, described by Lewin as the feeling that something that is "ours" is being stolen. As shown in the documents analyzed, the jealous frame can involve possessiveness of the beloved object, disqualification of competitors and distrust or blackmail, for example. As a result, there may be patrolling and control of the object that is about to be lost.[81] However, in the analyzed documents, James's jealousy is related to work and his position next to the messenger of the Lord, as it was his duty to advise her. The suspicion that others would be influencing Ellen appears in his speech: he hoped that this influence would be removed: "Elders Butler and Haskell have had an influence over her that I hope to see broken. It has nearly ruined her."[82] However, Ellen, who always remained independent of external influences in her prophetic ministry, pointed out the unjustified jealousy of James, which evolved even years later: "But if you are coming to discourage and weaken yourself and me by censure and suspicion and jealousy, I fear we should do great injury to the cause of God."[83]

Therefore, among other reasons, as noted above, James's strong temper can be understood as resulting from the limitations that the psychological and health crisis imposed with regard to the fulfillment of his "duty,"[84] as well as his departure from his intense work agenda as a prominent church leader. The desired outcome of the crisis, in these lines in the letters, always related to returning to work and Ellen's company, not in the sense of restoring their marriage (which had not been broken or denied), but in the sense of fulfilling the duty to do good for the church's mission.

On the other hand, the data indicates that James, despite the tensions and conflicts, insecurities and suspicions, did not give up on his mission. Although aged and broken, he found ways to reflect on his mistakes, acknowledge them,

[80]See, for example, this statement that James wrote to his son, "I hope you will not encourage Mother to print her books without me. If she chooses to say and write, very good. Then when May has all completed it will be but a small job for me to plan and arrange. Willie, you know I should hear every line read first" (J. White to My Dear Willie, 16 May 1876, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1).

[81]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 99–100.

[82]A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:445. In another occasion (1873), James and George Butler disagreed on leadership and church administration, and Ellen pointed out that Butler was acting wrongly ([E. G. White], "Diary," 8 May 1873 [Manuscript 7, 1873], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 6).

[83]Idem to Dear Husband, 10 July 1874 (Letter 40a, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:438.

[84]Ibid., 2:427.

and seek divine acceptance.[85] He did not reject his faith, repudiate the cause of the Advent, or deny his allegiance to Ellen (although they diverged in matters of personal opinion), but reaffirmed his belief and submission to the prophetic gift, as stated:

> I have never doubted the visions of Mrs. W[hite]. If a trial or temptation had for a moment come over my mind, as I did not, and could not, understand all, I at once fell back upon the vast amount of clear evidence in their favor, and there rested until all was made clear. . . . I have clearly seen the position and importance of the Testimonies in the work of the third message, and have prized them highly, and have designed ever to conform to their teachings. But I have not given them that reflection and attention I should. I have not read them over and over in order to keep their teachings fresh in my mind, as I should.[86]

> And now, as the consequence, just as the field is opening as never before, and there is so much very important work to be done, I have found myself for a few weeks past unable to do anything. And my cry has been, from December 20–26, [1872,] and still is, that God will raise me up once more and put His word within me, that I may have a part in the closing triumphs of the last message.[87]

> I have been able to make the full surrender of all to God, and as I have confessed my sins to God and those with me, and united with them in prayer for pardon, and restoration to peace of mind, faith, hope, and physical strength and health, the Spirit of God has come upon us in a wonderful degree.[88]

> I now feel sure that God has forgiven my sins, so far as I have seen them, and confessed them in the spirit of true repentance. My sins do not longer separate me from God. And as I have made a determined effort to draw nigh to God, He has come very nigh to me. That terrible weight of discouragement and gloom that has been upon me much of the time for the past two years is gone from me, and hope, courage, peace, and joy have taken its place.[89]

James thus reaffirmed his belief, maintened his marital fidelity, and declared that he was "never" suspicious of the prophetic gift of Ellen. Therefore, despite James's painful transition through disease and loss, mistakes and regret, the central aspects of his life (values, beliefs, and hopes), remained consistent with his speech until his last days. In this sense, we find a human James, who, despite his weaknesses, did not allow them to change the dominant meanings of his marriage and religious life. In this regard, James White appears as a wounded warrior who did not abandon the battlefield of their faith, and although he fell, remained always loyal to his ideals.

[85]Cf. Ibid., 2:427–429, 445.

[86]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 5; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:426; Douglass, *Messenger of the Lord*, 544.

[87]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 8–9; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:428.

[88]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 11; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:428–429.

[89]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*, 11; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:429.

The Medical Explanation

As already mentioned, the medical explanation for the origin of James's crisis, and how it was reflected in their marriage does not provide a satisfactory answer. The emphasis on a medical explanation for James's problems can be found in the hygiene campaign to improve the quality of life. Flavia Lemos and Daniele Vasco point out that medicalization is the transformation of social, political, economic, cultural, and subjective questions into medical issues.[90]

In the above sense, religious leaders, artists, and heroes, among others, tend to acquire a legendary meaning in the imaginations of people, especially fans of their ideological trend, cause, or religion. It is no different with James White, the pioneer and co-founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and partner and husband of the prophetess. The medical explanation can be used in behavioral cases socially considered "troublesome" to remove the responsibility for that behavior from the individual and society—part of the trend of hygienist ethics and of medicalization that emerged in the Western world in the second half of the nineteenth century.

But this concern with James's image is unnecessary. The James from the reports is not the James who was "made-up" and idealized to meet the artificial expectations of those who contemplate him. James appears as an ordinary and an extraordinary human being at the same time. Ordinary because he was real, and marriages and individuals without conflicts or difficulty do not exist, especially in the case of the Whites, considering their stress at work, James's temper, and his illness.

Only the ordinary James can be an example and warning to other human beings. If the conjugal life of the Whites did not contain these elements common to the human race, it would have been the product of fantasy, an idealization, an artificial construct of their biographers, or an apathetic and indifferent relationship of appearances. However, these possibilities cannot be true because the James described in the research data was human, real, common, and true. James suffered, Ellen suffered, and the people around him suffered with him; and where there is pain, there is a real person. So, we have the James that best fits the real world.

But James is also extraordinary because, according to the records, he stood out in making an unusual contribution with his exceptional talents at a key moment in the history of the Adventist Church, as he and Ellen believed. James was closer to the people when recognized as a human, subject to failure like any other. Few would follow a character that they knew to be fiction, but people will follow someone who is extraordinary, and yet one of them.

By identifying James as a common man, the extraordinary model shows that other common men can also be extraordinary. The strength of the example of James's life is, in fact, his real life, because of the ordinary dramas he lived, without disqualifying his outstanding contribution. So James's imperfection,

[90]Flávia Cristina Silveira Lemos and Daniele dos Santos Vasco, "Alguns Percursos Históricos entre o Higienismo e a Medicalização na Atenção à Infância e às Famílias," *Revista do Difere* 2.4 (2012): 1–20.

like that of any human being, cannot be seen as a demerit to be made up for, denied, or softened.

Therefore, James's personality and disease were barriers in the relationship, since they were elements that generated tension and created distance between him and Ellen. In addition, these barriers temporarily compromised their partnership in fulfilling the mission, which was the factor that centralized and organized the meanings of their marriage. This experience constitutes an example of how God uses ordinary people for His extraordinary works.

Ellen's Independence

Ellen's independence generated tension in the relationship with James. He wanted to control her agenda and her life in a way he had not previously. Adding to the difficulties of the relationship was Ellen's withdrawal from the domestic scene to do the field job that demanded her presence. This independent attitude displeased James, who feared that others were taking his place as Ellen's counselors. This led Ellen to exercise her freedom and independence even further and to stay away until the tension between them eased.

This leads us to the discussion and analysis of the information given in the outburst letters from Ellen to Lucinda Hall, a family friend. Two types of reasons can be found for her behavior: missiological and psychological.

Regarding the missiological reasons, the letters mention that Ellen resisted James's control because she felt she had a duty to accomplish. Here again we see the centrality of their mission. Ellen's independence was not due to a personal whim, but her decision to be faithful to the ideals they both had adopted to serve God. As we shall see, she played a submissive role as a humble wife who had emotional needs, but kept them under control. She was conciliatory and concerned about James, but he was hindering her work, and not keeping his word, unlike what he had done until then:

> He has said we must not seek to control each other. I do not own to doing it, but he has, and much more. I never felt as I do now in this matter. I cannot have confidence in James' judgment in reference to my duty.[91]

> But the Lord knows what is best for me, for James, and the cause of God. My husband is now happy—blessed news. . . . I will do my work as God leads me. He may do his work as God leads him. We will not get in each other's way. My heart is fixed, trusting in God. I shall wait for God to open my way before me.[92]

> A letter received from my husband last night shows me that he is prepared to dictate to me and take positions more trying than ever before. I have decided to attend no camp meetings this season. I shall remain and write. My husband can labor alone best. I am sure I can.[93]

[91]E. G. White to Dear Sister Lucinda, 10 May 1876 (Letter 64, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2; idem, *Daughters of God*, 267.

[92]Idem to Dear Sister Lucinda, 12 May 1876 (Letter 65, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; idem, *Daughters of God*, 268.

[93]Idem to Dear Lucinda, 16 May 1876 (Letter 66, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; idem, *Daughters of God*, 268.

> I see no light in my attending camp meetings. You and I decided this before you left. You must [not] allow the conference to press me out of the path of duty. The east will not see me for one year unless I feel that God calls me to go. He has given me my work. I will do it if I can be left free. I would enjoy attending the camp meetings if God said Go. I have no light as yet to go. The pillar of fire is here yet, when it moves I would move also. I want to follow it. I have no will of mine own; I want to do God's will. At present His will is to tarry in California and make the most of my time in writing. I shall be doing more for the cause in this than in going across the plains to attend camp meetings. I hope you will keep well.[94]

Thus, (1) she needed to maintain independence at work, as she was under the direction of God and not her husband, and (2) she was being consistent with the dynamics of their marital team, which, until then, had united them through a single purpose while each had freedom of action. She also maintained consistency with the goal of the marital team, which was to fulfill the mission. Thus, Ellen's withdrawal was vital to her realization as a person and to the very meaning of her relationship with James. The mission was to be preserved and carried forward, even at the price of momentary separation:

> Gladly would we attend the camp meetings east if we could feel that the Lord sends us. If it were duty I would go alone, but this is questionable.[95]

> I must be free to follow the leadings of the Spirit of God and go at His bidding, relying upon the light and sense of duty I feel, and leave you the same privilege. When we can work the best together we will do so. If God says it is for His glory we work apart occasionally, we will do that.[96]

> I miss you and would love you to be with you if this was the will of God, but He knoweth all things and will direct my path.[97]

> I love the labor connected with the camp meetings much better than I love writing. I enjoy traveling, but I feel that now is my time and opportunity to get out this long-neglected work. I desire the prayers of all my brethren that God would help me in the work rather than urgent appeals to attend camp meetings.[98]

> I waited for my husband's consent, and when, after a most solemn, humble seeking of God, . . . my husband wept aloud and said, "Ellen, you must go. . . . But what shall I do without you?"[99]

[94]Idem to Dear Husband, 7 April 1876 (Letter 4, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD.

[95]Idem to My Dear Willie, 15 May 1874 (Letter 27, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 3; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:430.

[96]E. [G. White] to My dear Husband, 2 July 1874 (Letter 38, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 3; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:434.

[97][E. G. White], Letter 11, 1876.

[98]Idem to Dear Husband, 25 April 1876 (Letter 14, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1.

[99]Idem, "Fragment—Reminiscences of Early Days in California," 1895 (Manuscript 62, 1895), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1 (This experience occurred in 1874 [A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:419–420, 430]). Ellen felt relieved

Therefore, the separation between Ellen and James during the crisis was justified by the missiological reasons that maintained and gave meaning to their unity. As Lewin points out, the loss of meaning in the marriage conspires against its unity.[100] The separation was necessary and, ultimately, understood by James.

The second set of reasons for Ellen's temporary separation from James were psychological. These reasons can be clearly identified in statements by both of them. James's temperament, with the changes caused by the disease, produced disturbance where once there was balance. He increasingly tried to dominate and control his wife, and felt jealousy related to the loss of his position. Ellen tried to help her husband and stood beside him until she felt exhausted and worn,[101] while maintaining her willingness to help him, as seen in her claims during that time:

> I am thoroughly disgusted with this state of things, and do not mean to place myself where there is the least liability of its occurring. . . . I can but dread the liability of James' changeable moods, his strong feelings, his censures, his viewing me in the light he does, and has felt free to tell me his ideas of my being led by a wrong spirit, my restricting his liberty, et cetera. . . . I cannot endure the thought of marring the work and cause of God by such depression as I have experienced all unnecessarily.[102]
>
> I cannot, and will not, be crippled as I have been.[103]
>
> The care falls principally upon me.[104]

---

when James understood the situation, as we see in these two examples: "I feel relieved in reading your last letter. I shall now feel it my duty to remain here this year and write and shall not attend the camp meeting this season without positive evidence that God requires it of me" ([E. G. White] to Dear Husband, 6 May 1876 [Letter 22, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2); "I am glad you continue free and happy, and that you feel so well satisfied in regard to my remaining in California. And that you are relieved of all burden of my writings. I am as pleased in regard to this as you are" (idem to Dear Husband, 11 May 1876 [Letter 24, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1).

[100]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 93, 95–98.

[101]Shortly after the stroke in 1865, James was so weak that he was forced into a temporary leave. After accompanying James to Dansville, New York, for three months of nursing hydrotherapy, Ellen decided to take care of him more appropriately at home (E. G. White, "Our Late Experience," *RH* 27.13 [1866]: 97–99). Although James was officially the president of the General Conference, he was unable to take care of administrative matters for a while. Thus, during 1866 and 1867, Ellen decided to put aside many of her responsibilities (travel, writing, etc.) and devote herself almost exclusively to his health. The Whites sold their home in Battle Creek and bought a small farm in Greenville, Michigan, where Ellen engaged James in both physical and mental work outdoors, which contributed greatly to his recovery (J. White and E. G.White, *Life Sketches* [1888], 354–358; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:157–168, 188–189).

[102]E. G. White, Letter 64, 1876, 1–2; idem, *Daughters of God*, 266–267.

[103]Idem, Letter 65, 1876, 1; idem, *Daughters of God*, 268.

[104]Idem to Edson and Emma White, 28 September 1877 (Letter 19, 1877), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD. 1; idem, *Daughters of God*, 273.

While Ellen acknowledged the care that her husband had for her when sick[105] and wanted to be with him during his illness,[106] things staying the same could have allowed the tension in the relationship to reach a point of compromise in the marriage.[107] The marital relationship is built on a common history of verbal exchanges and a common life.[108] Therefore, changes in the agenda of a spouse inevitably affect the other. This change was administered by Ellen in two stages: (1) staying with her husband while the mission could wait, and (2) in view of his signs of improvement and the wear on the relationship due to the change in James's actions and speech, continuing work without her husband's company.

In this sense, Ellen's attitude is perfectly understandable and even commendable, because staying near her spouse increased his controlling attitude and risked both aspects most cherished by the couple themselves: the fulfillment of the mission and the marriage bond. Thus, Ellen leaving the scene functioned as a stress-relief measure.

Lewin declares that control exerted by one spouse increases tension because it reduces what he calls free space, a vital necessity for individual and marital health. This reduction in space in the framework of conflict presented was associated with the dominant significance of the relationship (the fulfillment of the mission), which gave meaning and organized the symbolic universe of their marriage, and provided consistency to the existence of the couple and meaning to their lives, individually.[109]

[105]"I had been all my life an invalid, and tenderly and patiently had my husband sympathized with, watched over, and cared for me when I was suffering" (idem, "Early Counsels on Medical Work—No. 4: Blessings Through Prayer," *RH* 91.17 [1914]: 3; cf. idem, "Our Late Experience," *RH* 27.13 [1866]: 97).

[106]"I have no special news to write you, except I greatly desire to see your face and look forward to the time with great pleasure" (idem to Dear Husband, 17 July 1874 (Letter 44, 1874), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 3).

[107]"Having the opportunity to 'recharge your batteries,' whether alone or with friends and family, is even more important when you are a caregiving spouse, especially if you are overloaded with heavy care demands or if you are providing care and also performing multiple other roles. As a caregiver, you have to make time to care *for yourself*—both to keep yourself healthy (physically and mentally) and to manage stress" (Sara Palmer and Jeffrey B. Palmer, *When Your Spouse Has a Stroke: Caring for Your Partner, Yourself, and Your Relationship* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011], Kindle edition; italics original).

[108]Terezinha Féres-Carneiro, "Pesquisa e Prática Clínica: Construindo Articulações Teóricas," *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica* 21.3 (2008): 349–355; Terezinha Féres-Carneiro and Orestes Diniz-Neto, "De Onde Viemos? Uma Revisão Histórico Conceitual da Psicoterapia de Casal", *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa* 24.4 (2008): 487–496; Marilene A. Grandesso, *Sobre a Reconstrução do Significado: Uma Análise Epistemológica e Hermenêutica da Prática Clínica* (São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo, 2000), 212–238, 305–312.

[109]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 86–90, 93–94.

Sometimes a tense situation cannot be resolved, leading one or both spouses to withdraw from the group, destroying the conjugality.[110] James's desire to have Ellen close and control her worked as an external barrier to relieving tension. Ellen faced a dilemma: stay with her husband, which seemed to be the solution, or leave to accomplish the mission, which might seem strange at first for a kind wife. Since her leaving was not final—her spouse was either under the care of someone she could trust or recovered and working elsewhere—her decision was the most productive one. James was reasonably recovered and could be alone, and she followed his progress through daily correspondence with plans to reconnect at the proper time and in the proper conditions.

Thus, Ellen's withdrawal from the point of tension and her pleasure in her work prevented the relationship from being disrupted by excessive wear, allowed her to recover from the wear and from James himself, rescued the fulfillment of the mission, and maintained the marriage bond that lasted until James's death.[111]

Confidences to Lucinda Hall[112]

Another aspect to be considered is Ellen's confidences in her letters to Lucinda Hall. Relationship theorists point out that conflict is an integral part of any relational situation.[113] However, proper management of it prevents it from

[110]Ibid.

[111]A few weeks later (by the end of May 1876), they were together again and very busy writing, traveling, and preaching at camp meetings in Kansas, Missouri, and Iowa ([E. G. White] to Dear Children, Willie and Mary, 28 May 1876 [Letter 30, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 3:37). The work demanded so much of them, as pointed out by Ellen, "I find when the entire burden of labor rests on your Father and myself, we do not find time and have not strength to write even letters" ([E. G. White] to [Willie], 7 June 1876 [Letter 31a, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; cf. idem to Dear Children, Edson and Emma, 7 June 1876 [Letter 31, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD). When they finally arrived in Battle Creek at the beginning of July, they were "debilitated and run down like an old clock" (idem to Dear Children, 7 July 1876 [Letter 33, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 3:42). However, the meetings brought them "such satisfaction" they had never felt before in other camp meetings (E. G. White to Dear Children, Willie and Mary, 11 July 1876 [Letter 34, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 3:42).

[112]E. G. White considered Lucinda a "twin sister indeed in Christ" (E G. White to Dear Husband, 17 July 1874 [Letter 44, 1874], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 3; cf. idem to Dear Lucinda, 14 July 1875 [Letter 48, 1875], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2–3), "more than a sister" (idem to Dear Sister Lucinda, my More than Sister," 20 October 1874 [Letter 72, 1874], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD), and a "confidential companion" (idem to Dear Husband, 25 March 1876 [Letter 63, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2).

[113]Pedro Cunha, "A Diversidade de Práticas na Relação entre Gênero, Conflito e Negociação," *Revista da Faculdade de Ciências Humanas e Sociais da Universidade*

progressing to break up or violence. In this way, all relationships can last in the presence of conflict, including those that God has chosen for his work.

Certainly, once again, the idealization of heroes and pioneers of a community prevents their followers from accepting their humanity and imperfection. As a human being under stress because of the conflict, Ellen made use of her temporary absence from James as a strategy for stress relief. Moreover, she discussed the problem, so that verbalization could bring her release from the stress.

According to Vygotsky, humans are formed by sharing with each other through speech. This sharing can produce reframing of the issues that cause psychological distress, assisting in problem resolution. Since the human being is understood in Vygotskian psychology as an integral being, one cannot separate emotions from information and practice. Thus, speech (in a cultural-historical sense, understood in any of its verbal and nonverbal forms) allows sharing of emotions or problems and can bring relief to the individual.[114]

In addition, the "zone of proximal development" is defined in cultural-historical psychology as the difference between what an individual can accomplish alone and what he or she can do with the help of another who is more capable.[115] As said, in the theoretical proposal used here, the development of the individual cannot be fragmented. Therefore, in the absence of a trained professional, a trusted person who is not part of the problem and has social skills can provide a suffering person with relief by listening and sharing, as in Ellen's case. Thus, the letters from Ellen to Lucinda, as well as the conversations they had when they met, were providential opportunities for Ellen during a time of conflict—not only desired, but recommended, since isolation, theoretically, does not provide the progress that sharing offers. Ellen's attitude can be considered desirable and beneficial for her, as it eased her tensions and helped her to deal with the problem.

Furthermore, Lucinda had access to the Whites' house and was close to the couple for many years; she was a Christian friend with whom Ellen talked about her problems and was likely aware of the situation that was exacerbated by James's disease. Ellen wrote, "You knew when you left there was no one I could speak with, however distressed I might be."[116] As this was not new to Lucinda and did not hurt the secrecy of the couple, Ellen did not infringe on any of her ethical values, especially since the content of the letters did not address intimate matters. So, her sporadic trips away, her involvement in work activities, and her letters to Lucinda constituted Ellen's therapeutic strategy to help herself during the crisis.

Fernando Pessoa 5 (2008): 266–279; Pedro Cunha and Carla Lopes, "Cidadania na Gestão de Conflitos: A Negociação na, para e com a Mediação? *Antropológicas* 12 (2011): 38–43.

[114]Vygotsky, *Mind in Society*, passim.

[115]Ibid., 86.

[116]E. G. White to Dear Sister Lucinda, 17 May 1876 (Letter 67, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; idem, *Daughters of God*, 271.

Thus, Ellen's care to request the destruction of the letters[117] can be considered as simply Victorian caution. According to correspondence manuals of the time, private letters were never to be accessed by the public. So, this was not due to their content, which Lucinda knew already from spending time at the Whites' house, but to social ethics.[118] On the other hand, by failing to destroy the letters, Lucinda did not honor the trust of her friend and allowed the public a look into her domestic affairs, when Ellen, following the Bible's counsel (1 Cor 12:25; Gal 6:2), was just looking for a shoulder to cry on.[119]

Nevertheless, Lucinda's attitude allowed future generations to see that men and women of God are vulnerable to universal human problems; and those who read these letters can take comfort in the knowledge that, just like the prophets of the past, who were sure of God's call, everyone can legitimately seek help and fulfill the mission entrusted to them, no matter the difficulties in which they find themselves.

Promoting Factors of James and Ellen White's Marriage

This study identified several promoting factors or potential promoters of James and Ellen's marriage. Some of them are ambivalent factors—those that, depending on the time or circumstances of the individual disposition, can have "positive valence," functioning as promotion, or "negative valence," acting as a barrier.[120] Some of these factors have already been mentioned when discussing the other categories, so we will only mention them briefly to characterize them.

Working Together

This promotion factor appears in the letters and is the positive valence of working with family. Normally, a job superimposed on a marriage can take first place in the life of one spouse, or both, and separate the conjugal group or dissolve it by abandonment. However, in the case of the Whites, their joined work functioned as a uniting factor.

It was a barrier and source of tension at times when they could not accompany each other or when James tried to exercise control over Ellen's work. But, most of the time, their work was the dominant meaning and

[117]Idem, Letter 67, 1876, 1; idem, *Daughters of God*, 264.

[118]Lystra, 2009.

[119]These letters were found in an old trunk that was acquired by Susan Jaquete, and finally came to belong to the White Estate in 1973. The collection contained about 2000 letters of which 39 were written by Ellen White and some by James White (A. L. White, "Ellen White Letters Discovered in Historical Collection," *RH* 150.33 [1973]: 1, 10–11; Paul Gordon and Ron Graybill, "Letters to Lucinda: Excerpts from the Ellen White Messages Found in the Newly Discovered Collection," *RH* 150.34 [1973]: 4–7; E. G. White, *Daughters of God*, 264).

[120]*Valence* is a term used in psychology (translated to the german *valenz*, used by Lewin) in discussing emotional attractiveness [positive] or aversiveness [negative] (Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts*, 59, 60, 135, 155).

organizer of other meanings present in the life of the couple. Working together gave them company, converging mutual interests, shared achievement, and a feeling of teamwork.[121]

Mutual Appreciation: Respect, Affection, and Admiration

Another promoting factor in the Whites' relationship was their mutual appreciation. This element is evident in the respect they each had for the skills or gifts of the other, as well as their affection and mutual admiration. James particularly respected Ellen as a prophet, although he disagreed with some of her private opinions.[122] He maintained his conviction about Ellen's prophetic gift even during the critical periods of his disease.[123] Ellen, in turn, praised James's writing ability and preaching, his potential future in the mission, and his past accomplishments in those areas.[124] Thus, mutual appreciation strengthened the group, satisfying their need for recognition and bringing them closer as a marriage group.[125]

The Whites' Religious Worldview

The third promoting factor present in the letters was the religious worldview of the Whites. They lived with extraordinary conviction in the message they embraced. They feared that they would fail in the mission if one weakened the influence of the other or if they failed to do all the good they could in the time they had. They expected the imminent return of Jesus; James felt that God had commissioned him to be next to Ellen (in addition to being the husband and supporter of the prophetess); and she believed that God had special work to do through both of them. Even during relationship crises, their religious worldview and their individual and joined prayers worked to reinforce their marriage ties as they wished to resume the work they believed God had given them. In this sense, their religious belief—that they were in the world on a mission for God—gave extra meaning to their marriage.

[121]"Many of the pioneers, who shared with us these trials and victories, remained true till the close of life, and have fallen asleep in Jesus. Among these is *the faithful warrior* who *for thirty-six years stood by my side in the battle for truth*. God used him as a teacher and leader to stand in the front ranks during the severe struggles of those early days of the message; but he has fallen at his post, and, with others who have died in the faith, he awaits the coming of the Lifegiver, who will call him from his gloomy prison-house to a glorious immortality" (E. G. White, "Notes of Travel: The Cause in Vermont," *RH* 60.46 [1883]: 721 [emphasis supplied]).

[122]Cf. idem, Letter 66, 1876, 2–3 (in idem, *Daughters of God*, 268–270).

[123]J. White, *A Solemn Appeal*; idem, *Spirit of Prophecy* (Battle Creek, MI: Review & Herald, 1878), passim; idem, *The Spirit of Prophecy or Perpetuity and Object of the Gifts* (Battle Creek, MI: Review & Herald, 1880), passim.

[124]E. G. [White], Letter 38, 1874, 2; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:433.

[125]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 95.

Mutual Complementation

The fourth promotion factor was the complementation of the couple. Their temperaments were different, but their talents and roles in the marital relationship complemented each other. James was the leader, a strong personality, tireless organizer, entrepreneur, and excellent writer and speaker. Ellen was naturally shy, but also a strong-willed woman[126] and had the gift of prophecy. James was her counselor and took the position of supporting her in the transmission of her messages. Ellen recognized this mutual dependency:

> God has a great work for him and me. We shall have strength to perform it.[127]
>
> Father, I fear, would not do as well if I should leave him. We ought to labor unitedly together.[128]

After the death of her husband, she penned:

> I miss Father more and more. Especially do I feel his loss while here in the mountains. . . . I am fully of the opinion that my life was so entwined or interwoven with my husband's that it is about impossible for me to be of any great account without him.[129]
>
> But how I miss him! How I long for his words of counsel and wisdom! How I long to hear his prayers blending with my prayers for light and guidance, for wisdom to know how to plan and lay out the work![130]

Thus, one completed the other in married life and mission.

The Accession of James to the Ideals of the Couple and His Repentance

James's commitment to their marital ideals stands out, as discussed above, in several ways. First, he was committed to the mission as an important meaning for the couple, and contributed to the marriage team as an adding factor to the relationship.[131] Second, he respected the prophetic gift of his wife and firmly believed he had been chosen to be at Ellen's side in her prophetic ministry, playing a dual role in the marital relationship as husband and prophetess supporter. This role of supporter was an additional sacred meaning of their marriage and an element that could strengthen the group.[132] Third, he showed an attitude of humble repentance and sought reconciliation with God in his letters of apology for ignoring the warnings of his wife regarding his physical and spiritual health. This humble and conciliatory attitude reaffirmed the marital bond, during and after the critical period of James's disease. Therefore,

[126]Knight, *Walking with Ellen White*, 72.

[127]E. G. White, Letter 19, 1877, 1; idem, *Daughters of God*, 273.

[128]Idem, Letter 27, 1874, 3; A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:430.

[129]E. G. White to Dear Son Willie, 22 September 1881 (Letter 17, 1881), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; idem, *Daughters of God*, 273.

[130]Idem to My dear sister Robinson, 27 November 1899 (Letter 196, 1899), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; idem, *Daughters of God*, 274.

[131]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 95–98.

[132]Ibid.

James's adherence to their ideals and his humble repentance were promoter elements of their marital relationship.

Ellen's Personality

Most of the letters from Ellen to James reveal the dynamics of the relationship and their roles within the marriage. Again, the nineteenth-century culture, in which the man assumed the dominant role in the relationship, is evident in the content of the letters written by Ellen. It is important to mention that she wrote frequently to him; for a period of forty-five days, in 1876, she did it almost every day, although James did not respond with the same frequency.[133]

Ellen's personality is evident in the letters. Taking a random sample of eight letters[134] written during a period of tension when they were working in separate places, five aspects stand out: submission, humility, affection, an attitude of reconciliation, and concern for James.

Submission

The first trait of Ellen's personality that appears in these letters is submission. This is evident because Ellen was careful in telling James where she was going, what she was doing, and whom she was with. She gave reports of her daily activities; waited for his "orders" to make household decisions; and informed him who was accompanying her in her trips and activities. The letters continually say that she was accompanied by women or relatives, working on her writings or praying for him, and, in one of them, she assured him that she was not using her freedom more than necessary: "In regard to my independence, I have had no more than I should have in the matter under the circumstances. I do not receive your views or interpretation of my feelings on this matter."[135]

Thus, Ellen indicated her independence, but the letters emphasize that this referred to her mission. She mentioned in one letter that she was about "to remain in California and do my writings" and later wrote, "I would not allow anyone to call me from my work." However, in the same paragraph, when the subject changed to the purchase of a horse or carriage for the couple's use, she waited for James's decision. While Ellen thought she was entitled to it, she

[133]From 31 March to 16 May 1876, there are thirty-one letters addressed to James White (Letters 1, 1a, 2, 3, 4, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 16a, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 25a, 26, 27, 63). She even apologized for being too repetitive: "Dear Husband: I expect you will get wearied with my letters. There is such a sameness in them" ([E. G. White] to Dear Husband, 28 April 1876 [Letter 16, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD 1).

[134]All of the following were from 1876: Letter 3 (4 April), 5 (11 April), 7 (14 April), 9 (18 April), 11 (20 April), 16 (28 April), 25 (12 May), and 27 (16 May).

[135]Idem to Dear Husband, 12 May 1876 (Letter 25, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2.

asked her husband's opinion, looking for his approval, as well as in relation to other matters, as follows:

> I think it is due myself to have some of these privileges. What do you think?[136]
>
> In reference to furnishing [the] new house, please send in your orders as to what furniture you want and your wishes shall be complied with. It is your house and of course you have the right to say how it shall be furnished. . . . In regard to our pictures, how many shall we order[?] . . . Everyone thinks [that] these last from Dunham's are perfect. What is your judgment?[137]
>
> In regard to publishing my book here, what do you think of it? The manuscript could at once be put in the hands of the printers. Will you please inform us in reference to this.[138]
>
> Yesterday prepared matter from my book for the Signs. Now please tell me, Shall I give a full relation of our experience in the eastern fanaticism and shall I give particulars of cases that were healed?[139]

Therefore, her independence, in harmony with other statements, refers to her work as a prophetess, but the letters contain elements of submission from Ellen to James in other aspects of life. Graybill argues that Ellen would "emerge as the dominant figure in the home and an independent leader in the church" in the last fifteen years of their marriage, which he attributes to the change of roles due to James's illness.[140] Thus, agreeing with the analysis of this author, this independence must refer only to her work, as the relationship between patient and caregiver is one of care and not of domination.

Domination, in literature, is seen as an asymmetry in gender relations, cultural and naturalized, but that was not Ellen's posture after James's disease. The periods of James's illness required the addition of new roles, and Ellen, the wife, now also became the caregiver.

In the analysis of the central meaning of the Whites' marriage, we have seen that, even during James's illness, Ellen kept a submissive attitude,

[136]Ibid.

[137]Idem, Letter 3, 1876, 3–4; cf. idem to Dear Husband, 24 March 1876 (Letter 1a, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1; idem to Dear Husband, 16 April 1876 (Letter 8, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; idem, Letter 14, 1876; idem to Dear Husband, 31 April 1876 (Letter 17, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; idem to Dear Husband, 5 May 1876 (Letter 21 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD.

[138]Idem to Dear Husband, 8 April 1876 (Letter 4a, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD.

[139]Idem to Dear Husband, 1 May 1876 (Letter 20, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD. She then gives her own opinion, but reemphasizes that she honors her husband's views, and adds, "Please write something in regard to the matter. We want you to state your views freely" (ibid.). Some days later she continued asking for his advice on the best way of writing her autobiography, "I would be glad to hear some expression from you in reference to the *Signs*. How do you like the way we are getting out my life? What do you think of it?" (idem, Letter 21, 1876; cf. idem to Dear Husband, 10 May 1876 [Letter 23, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD).

[140]Graybill, "The Power of Prophecy," 25.

declaring her independence only for two interconnected reasons: matters of conscience and compliance with her prophetic mission.[141] In addition, the data characterizes the relationship of the Whites as a complementary partnership that was important for the fulfillment of the mission. James's disease awakened in him a desire to control Ellen,[142] but we do not have sufficient data to determine whether Ellen wished to control James, despite her independence in traveling and working alone.

As she explained, submission was part of her conception of marriage, except in matters of conscience: "We women must remember that God has placed us subject to the husband. He is the head and our judgment and views and reasonings must agree with his if possible. If not, the preference in God's Word is given to the husband where it is not a matter of conscience. We must yield to the head."[143]

Ellen did not understand submission as associated with circumstantial reasons, but as a biblical principle. To give up this principle would be a self-contradiction, an incoherence that is not identified as we refine and expand the analysis of the data. Her independence was, therefore, limited to her prophetic mission, given by God and superior to the husband's authority.[144]

Ellen excepted herself from submission in matters of "conscience" because she considered it a "duty" for the cause, for which she should not submit to her husband, since he could not accompany her. Once again, we see the centrality of the mission as the dominant meaning in the life of the couple, which supported Ellen's freedom and independence—not independence from the marriage, but to fulfill the purpose of both their lives, which continued even after the death of James.[145]

[141]A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:431–432.

[142]Ibid., 2:431.

[143]E. G. White to Dear Sister Mary [Loughborough], 6 June 1861 (Letter 5, 1861), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2 (quoted in A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:431).

[144]As admitted in the qualitative research, the human being is a complex object of study whose experience cannot be defined in a simplified manner. Many simultaneous conflicts are identified in human experience through research in the humanities. People can deal simultaneously with their past, their multiple collections and roles, their ideals and values, often under subjective and relational conflict, without it necessarily meaning contradiction. The harmony with the biblical ideal is a continuous walking, which often coexists with ambiguous and ambivalent situations, searching for an experience closer to the ideal. Without denying the biblical ideal, accepted by her, of essential equality and mutual respect and cooperation between men and women, the declared marital experience of Ellen White has (as in all human beings) this complexity. Thus men and women can and must move towards the ideal of equality in mutual cooperation, despite having to live with the peculiarities of sinful world. The ideal of equality is for everyone in the world and in the church, but even in the church, sometimes, we see the tension between the ideal and our practice, due to the imperfection brought by sin. The authors believe that Ellen White was not immune to this strain.

[145]Cf. E. G. White, *Daughters of God*, 274.

Humility

Another aspect of Ellen's personality that appears in the letters is her humility in the face of their marital tensions that were due to James's temperament and disease. She repeatedly apologized for worrying him, although she was disapproving of behavior that he himself would later recognize as wrong.[146] She apologized for letting a day pass without writing to him, and her arguments always had a conciliatory tone due to the marital tensions.

Need for Affection

A third aspect evidenced in the letters is Ellen's need for affection. She clearly mentioned that she needed his support, and complained that he did not respond and give his opinions about her feelings, asking him to write her. Then, she wrote about her sadness and need for affection that she fulfilled in God and explained that she missed James. However, Ellen put the mission God gave her first.

Concern for James

The fourth aspect of Ellen's personality in the marital relationship that stands out is her concern for James's health. She revealed that she was "anxiously waiting" to hear from him,[147] "very sad" that he was sick,[148] and "so glad" when she received news that her husband was fine.[149] She asked for prayers for her "dear husband" to be strengthend physically and to have a clearer mind. The theme is also present in her letter of outburst to Lucinda Hall: "How is James' health? I had a dream that troubled me in reference to James."[150] This concern for her husband's health was always present in Ellen's messages to him, particularly due to his overwork and disease.[151]

[146]Cf. A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:426–429.

[147]E. G. White, Letter 5, 1876, 1.

[148]Idem to Dear Husband, 18 April 1876 (Letter 9, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 2; idem, Letter 11, 1876, 1.

[149]Idem to Dear Husband, 14 April 1876 (Letter 7, 1876), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD, 1.

[150]Idem, Letter 66, 1876, 4.

[151]Cf. A. L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 2:426–429. "We have felt some anxious in regard to your health on account of the change of climate at this season of the year. It must be trying to your system, but we hope you will take the best of care of yourself, that your health may not suffer. I hope that this journey will be indeed to you a season of rest rather than toil. I shall press through my work as fast as possible. We pray every day and many times through the day that God would guide you in judgment, [and] impart to you heavenly wisdom. We believe that He will do for us the things we ask of Him" (E. G. White to Dear Husband, 11 April 1876 [Letter 5, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; cf. idem to Dear Husband, 12 April 1876 [Letter 6, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD; idem to Dear Husband, 14 April 1876 [Letter 7, 1876], Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD).

Conciliatory Attitude

The final aspect is her conciliatory attitute. During the crisis, Ellen showed a consistent conciliatory attitude toward the tensions generated by James's behavior. In her letters to him there are no attacks, accusations, or even personal deprecations. Ellen preserved and supported her husband, even when she disagreed with him, and asked for his opinion, as in the case of her independence to work; she mentioned waiting "anxiously" for his answers. She also asked him "please" to write something about the things in her letter[152] and revealed that she would be sad if she had "said or written anything" that grieved, annoyed, or distressed James. She expressed concern for "differences to separate [their] feelings," admitted that she was wrong, apologized, and promised to never say or write anything that could disturb him.[153] So Ellen played an important role in the conciliatory mood of the couple.

Thus, Ellen can be described as a submissive, humble, and conciliatory wife who recognized her needs and made them explicit to her husband, but found relief in the spiritual life through faith and prayer and constantly cared for the health of her husband. These characteristics point to her acceptance of James, even during the tensions, which created a stable psychological ground for both in the relationship.[154] However, Ellen dared not tie herself to her husband to the point of giving up their ideal of living for the mission. Thus, the submissive Ellen in the relationship was also the independent Ellen, moderator and promoter of her marriage, never denying or compromising it, even during the most difficult times.

Synthesis of These Meanings in the Conjugal Life of the Couple

As we have seen, this research, based on a qualitative approach with cultural-historical psychology as its theoretical framework, used Bardin's analysis of content, referenced in Lewin's theory, which understands marriage as working within group dynamics. Despite the limitations, given the breadth of the theme, the research answered the question about the meanings the Whites built for their marriage, based on documents they produced. Also, the proposed objectives in understanding the marital relationship of the Whites in the context of the nineteenth-century were satisfactorily met: (1) to describe and analyze the meanings and practices of the marital

[152]Idem, Letter 5, 1876.

[153]Idem, Letter 27, 1876. "We are living in a most solemn time and we cannot afford to have in our old age differences to separate our feelings. I may not view all things as you do, but I do not think it would be my place or duty to try to make you see as I see and feel as I feel. Wherein I have done this, I am sorry. . . . I do not claim infallibility, or even perfection of Christian character. I am not free from mistakes and errors in my life. Had I followed my Saviour more closely, I should not have to mourn so much my unlikeness to His dear image. . . . No more shall a line be traced by me or expression made in my letters to distress you. Again, I say forgive me, every word or act that has grieved you" (ibid., 1).

[154]Lewin, "Conflict in Marriage," 85–86.

relationship of the Whites present in the documents produced by the couple, and (2) to identify consistencies or inconsistencies between the speech and practice of the couple with regard to their marital life.

The data present in the documents examined were organized into three thematic blocks. First, was the dominant meaning of the Whites' marriage. It was possible to identify that the relationship of the Whites, though possessing some common characteristics of the nineteenth-century marriages, did not fit the romanticism of the time, as indicated by the meanings present in the letters. They did not emphasize intimate love leaning toward passion and eroticism, for example. However, the data show no complaints of a sexual nature or conflicts in other areas of life together that would mean dysfunctionality in the relationship.

Still, in the first block, the meanings that appear in the data point to a couple whose dominant meaning was the mission of proclaiming the Advent message, and who, in carrying out that mission, found their raison d'être as individuals and as a conjugal couple. The mission thus functioned as the organizational basis and meaning of the White couple, as can be seen throughout their history, in biographical and autobiographical works.

The second thematic block organizes the main barriers of the marital relationship into two types: (1) James's personality and his disease, and (2) Ellen's independence. The first barrier was that James's strong and controlling personality was changed by the succession of strokes and became an element that contributed to tension and conflict. The disease acted as a breakdown in the couple's path, leading to a transition in which actions in search of balance affected the dynamics of the couple and their immediate setting, involving friends and co-workers.

In the process, both James and Ellen experienced significant losses. In the case of James, it was an emphasis on "unsatisfied need" or "the state of hunger," meaning he felt empty because of the limitations the disease imposed on his ability to work and exert control, as well as the withdrawal of the mission as the central meaning of his life. In this respect, work for the couple was an ambivalent factor because, while it united them, in excess, it became a barrier in the relationship.

James's behavior worsened in a behavior-illness-behavior cycle, creating progressive tension in the marriage group. Thus, the Whites lived a crisis that went beyond the purely medical explanation. However, James and Ellen, as individuals and as a couple, kept intact the core aspects of their religion and marital relationship, controlling and reducing the level of tension in search of stability, and emphasizing functionality in the relationship.

The other identified barrier was the independence of Ellen. It was also an ambivalent element that functioned to create distance in time of crisis. Her freedom to act caused tension in her relations with James, but, at the same time, allowed her to take the initiative to do things that relieved tension and led to reconciliation.

The second theme points to several prominent factors or potential promoters of the relationship: (1) their work together; (2) mutual appreciation:

respect, affection, and mutual admiration; (3) a common religious worldview; (4) a complementary relationship; (5) the accession of James to the ideals of the couple and his repentance; and (6) Ellen's personality, which functioned as a consistently conciliatory element of the relationship.

The Whites appear in the data analyzed in the text as a couple united by the mission. Despite the difficulties inherent in conjugality, the trajectory of the couple shows the functionality of the relationship along the marital career to the end. Throughout their married life, they adopted strategies that seemed more appropriate for them to remain united and fulfill the purpose they believed God had given them. In this sense, it was a couple that fought the good fight as best as they could.

It can be concluded, in summary, that the Whites can be described as a functional pair who faced marital conflicts in some phases of their career. These conflicts are understood as elements inherent in the developmental process of groups and individuals, which did not affect the central aspects of their marriage. The Whites' lives were consistent with their values, beliefs, and ideals, and they presented meanings of accomplishment and mutual satisfaction in their lifetime trajectory, as a conjugal group and as individuals.

Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 54, No. 2, 315–332.

IMMANUEL KANT'S ATONEMENT "WITHIN THE BOUNDS OF BARE REASON" AND THE VIABILITY OF MORAL RECEPTIVITY AS A CONDITION OF GRACE

Derek S. Nutt
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Immanuel Kant attempted to articulate an account of religion that provides genuine hope through its rational certitude and universal applicability. Kant's analytical foray into the mysteries of the atonement was not a biblical or systematic theological project. Through the practical reason primordially present to humankind, he sought a "pure religion" where individual belief in personal salvation is warranted.[1] Whereas Kant is attempting to build a system acceptable within a purely rational worldview, and thereby uses philosophical presuppositions that disallow historical, religious propositions, he does not deny the possibility of what Christian tradition asserts was accomplished in first-century Palestine.[2]

Preliminarily, I intend to establish that a concatenation of Kant's epistemology, moral philosophy, and view of providence brings him to a subjective atonement. Then, I explore two foci that challenge the consistency of Kant's subjective account of atonement. The first problem embraces the removal of debt both before and after conversion. The second problem is that Kant's purely rational system is unable to adequately articulate the possibility and identity of grace in relation to the moral agent. Kant's attempt involves a remarkably innovative proposal of a dynamic interplay of God and humankind in justification, which could be meaningful within a covenantal framework for understanding salvation. However, the weakness of Kant's covenantal perspective results in a moral interpretation of the atonement that is contradictory, ambiguous, and paradoxical. For his purposes of providing warrant for a personal belief in salvation, Kant's unresolved problems with explaining atonement bring his interpreters back full circle through the use of "bare reason" to an inexorable distance between God and sinful humankind.

[1]Nicholas P. Wolterstorff, "Conundrums in Kant's Rational Religion," in *Kant's Philosophy of Religion Reconsidered*, ed. Philip J. Rossi & Michael Wreen (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991).

[2]Immanuel Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, ed. and trans. Allen W. Wood and George di Giovanni, The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 445–446 (*AA* 28:1120–1121). The following abbreviations are used hereafter in the footnotes of this article to refer to Kant's texts: "*AA*" refers to the Prussian Academy edition (Preussische Akademie-Ausgabe) of Kant's Works and this precedes the volume and page number(s). "A" and "B" refer to the first and second editions, respectively, of Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Critique of Pure Reason) and are followed by the page number(s).

Epistemology as Precursor to View of Atonement

Kant's theory of knowledge begins with the premise that the human mind is innately structured to project reality. The laws of nature, incumbent on the "world" of *phenomena*, act by physical necessity, and causal relations can be known in time so that certain knowledge of nature is possible. The individual receives information through the senses, and their mind organizes the material data according to its a priori intuitions of time and space. Further a priori categories of the understanding rearrange the data into various modes of relationship. As long as a concept of the understanding is originally derived from sense experience, it is able to be held as scientific knowledge. That is, it may be accepted as objective knowledge, versus opinion or belief.[3]

But there is also an "intelligible world" that is not subject to the strictures of space and time and cannot be understood, scientifically speaking. Items in this transcendent realm are not accessible by reason's theoretical use. They have no referent in sensible experience, and thus, transcendental ideas such as God, the soul, and the workings of divine grace are unknowable by reason's theoretical use, even partially or analogically.[4]

Leaving the transcendent and returning to the historical/spatiotemporal, Kant allows that empirical facts may be gathered about historical events, but their essential identity remains elusive. This means that historical facts can provide no objective knowledge on which to ground religious belief.[5] This is because the essence (*Ding an sich; noumenon*) of any historical thing (e.g., Jesus of Nazareth, the cross) is timeless. But the object as one can know it, the *phenomenon*, is temporal and subject to change. This gives it a lesser degree of reality, not absolute reality.[6]

Besides people and events, special revelation also occurs in history and is particularly found in nature. This means that it is not accessible to all but is subject to personal interpretation—for who can be assured that their interpretation is the correct one? Therefore, all human beings cannot be responsible or be required to find a rationally certain basis for hope from the content of special revelation. Furthermore, it provides no rational, scientific knowledge of metaphysical truths. If humankind can have no rational knowledge of ultimate reality, then it follows logically that the intelligible world (and an ultimate being) must not be able to present at least a partial picture of ultimate reality, say perhaps, with the assistance of grace, to all finite beings. There is, for Kant, a gulf between the knowledge of the transcendental and phenomenal "world" that cannot be bridged by theoretical reason's grasp of a special revelation. To recklessly attempt to do so is superstition.[7]

[3]Idem, *The Critique of Pure Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 500 (A, 471; *AA* 3:327); idem, *Religion and Rational Theology*. 13–14 (*AA* 8:141).

[4]Idem, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, 409 (B, 396; *AA* 3:261).

[5]Idem, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 142 (*AA* 6:109–110).

[6]Idem, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, 181 (B, 52; *AA* 3:61).

[7]Idem, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 280–285 (*AA* 7:65).

Kant's treatment of providence parallels the existence of this gulf between *noumena* and the *phenomena* of history. Providence does not include, as Christian tradition has typically presented it, a divine being's personal interventions, or miraculous and particular acts of preservation in history. For Kant, the laws of nature were established by one act of God in eternity and work only according to their necessary functioning in time.[8] It is actually they who are directly guiding the course of history and the destiny of the human species. Kant calls this predetermined providence "that great artist, nature."[9]

The notion of special revelation, in which God arbitrarily breaks through and enlightens some particular people or prophet, is unfathomable; the miraculous incarnation of an eternal being in time would also conflict with the laws of nature. Moreover, even if either of these happened, the group or individual would have no way of knowing for certain that it was God talking to them or walking among them.[10]

The historical event of atonement, the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth, is understood by humankind through such a historical revelation. Only a portion of humanity is exposed to this content, however. This is not sufficient for Kant's intentions of a pure religion, since that religion must be universally accessible to be valid. The historical, atoning death of Jesus has been received through "outer" revelation and does not provide certain, verifiable content for a pure religion constituted by reason. The essence (*noumenon*) of the historical crucifixion, its true meaning, is also completely unintelligible to theoretical reason. Furthermore, it is not accessible to all. Therefore, there must be another form of revelation, a greater "inner" revelation by way of reason, that can make the historical event (e.g., the cross) rationally useful. This would allow all of humankind to have genuine hope in salvation.[11]

Where speculative reason fails for Kant, he retains entrance to the transcendental realm by proposing that the quest for justified belief is realized only by means of the use of practical reason. Each person has an a priori consciousness of the moral law. As a free moral agent, they are also aware of themselves as both an intelligible and phenomenal individual.[12] In the world

[8]Kant considers providence as the equivalent of the laws of nature, which God has already "wound" as a clock: "and for this reason nature, regarded as a necessitation by a cause the laws of whose operation are unknown to us, is called 'fate,' but if we consider its purposiveness in the course of the world as the profound wisdom of a higher cause directed to the objective final end of the human race and predetermining the course of the world, it is providence" (ibid., 331 [*AA* 8:360–362]); Kant writes also, "Providence is in God one single act" (ibid., 437 [*AA* 28:1110]).

[9]Idem, "Zum ewigen Frieden," Prussian Academy of Sciences, n.d., https://korpora.zim.uni-duisburg-essen.de/Kant/aa08/360.html (*AA* 8:360).

[10]Idem, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 444 (*AA* 28:1118).

[11]Ibid., 443 (*AA* 28:1117). See also 140–152 (*AA* 6:108–120).

[12]Idem, *Practical Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 98, 218 (*AA* 4:451; *AA* 5:97–98). In Allen W. Wood, *Kant's Moral Religion* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1970), 6, Wood states this dichotomy by saying that for Kant "human nature is dialectical."

of appearances, they are subject to physical necessity and particular conditions, but in the intelligible world they are absolutely free and wholly responsible for their conduct. They are able to deduce a categorical imperative to obey the moral law and, from that, the transcendental ideas of God, immortality, and freedom; and with these, practical reason demands that the attainment of the highest good (*summum bonum*)—moral perfection and a proportional conferral of eternal happiness—must be possible.[13]

Atonement Apart from Revelation

Filtered through his epistemic limitations and emboldened by his robust moral philosophy (adumbrated above),[14] Kant's version of religion is an account of the existential perspective of the moral agent as they endeavor to find certainty in the hope that they can attain eternal blessedness (*summum bonum*).[15] Here we arrive at an analysis of *Religion Within the Boundaries of Bare Reason*, a remarkable attempt by the Enlightenment philosopher to establish epistemic justification for personal salvation.[16]

An initial problem that Kant's account of atonement faces is the question of the removal of debt before conversion.[17] Since, according to the categorical imperative of moral duty, one "ought" to be holy according to the moral law, it follows that one "can." Kant expresses it in this way: "The human being must make or have made *himself* into whatever he is or should become in a moral sense, good or evil. These two [characters] must be an effect of his free power of choice, for otherwise they could not be imputed to him, and consequently, he could be neither *morally* good nor evil."[18]

The "ought implies can" principle places the highest duty upon the individual and demands by itself that their achievement of the highest good occurs without external assistance. External propitiation for the debt caused by infinite, radical evil, the "most personal of all liabilities," is not only unethical, but it would destroy freedom, a founding element of the moral

[13]Kant, *Practical Philosophy*, 238–240, 246–247 (*AA* 5:122–124, 132).

[14]The interpretation of Kant's philosophy is obviously far from comprehensive, but this is a brief outline intended merely to show on what basis Kant must move to a subjective atonement.

[15]I do not intend here that Kant reduced religion as a whole to morality. He did not disregard ecclesiastical religion and faith entirely, as mentioned earlier, only that as part of his philosophical project, moral reason is the only means of gaining certifiable evidence to justify religious belief (see Wolterstorff, "Conundrums," 41).

[16]Ibid.

[17]I use the term "before conversion" for purposes of understanding Kant's thought in the context of soteriological discourse; as will be shown, the *noumenal* self, which must enact its conversion outside of time with absolute spontaneity, cannot technically be construed in terms of "before" and "after." Thus, throughout this paper, references to a before and after conversion are not used technically, although they are accurate from the perspective of Kant's *phenomenal* self.

[18]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 89 (*AA* 6:44).

self.[19] Obviously, this is problematic from the perspective of traditional Christian soteriology, especially if this is all Kant has to offer.[20] One would think that Kant is left with only the prospect of personal remission. But to the contrary, the individual is also equally incapable of paying their own debt.[21]

Further exacerbating the difficulty of debt is Kant's insistence on the absolute spontaneity of the human will in his concept of freedom.[22] The spontaneous freedom of the will, grounded only in the law, is by definition autonomous; this distances the radically evil, supersensible self from any external assistance, since autonomy makes it impossible for any external entity to condition or determine volition, be it divine, human, sensible experience, or otherwise.[23]

With the above factors in mind, Kant attempts to solve the problem of debt before conversion in a most creative way. He posits in the moral consciousness of the individual an archetype through which each may recognize, and acquire force to achieve, the ideal of moral perfection. One's duty is to adopt ("elevate themselves to") the disposition of this prototype into their own maxim so that they possess, as close as possible, the disposition of the prototype. At this time, satisfaction for sin is also made and conversion from the evil to the good disposition occurs, as Kant writes:

> [T]he punishment must be thought of as executed in the situation of the conversion itself . . . conversion is an exit from evil and an entry into goodness, "a putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new." . . . The emergence from the corrupted disposition into the good is in itself already sacrifice and entrance into a long train of life's ills which the new human undertakes in the disposition of the Son of God."[24]

This solution Kant presents of the "new man" suffering and satisfying the punishment (paying the debt) due the "old man" is not analytically

[19]Ibid., 113 (*AA* 6:72).

[20]John Silber, "The Ethical Significance of Kant's Religion," in *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, trans. Theodore M. Greene and Hoyt H. Hudson (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), cxxxii. Silber is correct when he writes that Kant's view of freedom is logically incompatible with grace even though Kant insisted on the possibility of grace: "When Kant confronted the Antinomies, he presented thesis and antithesis and then offered a resolution. His absolute conception of freedom precludes the need for grace, since every guilty man freely wills to become guilty; the purity of the moral precludes grace; for grace violates the uncompromising nature of the law" (ibid.).

[21]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 112 (*AA* 6:72).

[22]Idem, *Practical Philosophy*, 94; idem, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 72–73 (*AA* 4:46; *AA* 6:23–24). Kant writes that "freedom of the power of choice has the characteristic, entirely peculiar to it, that it cannot be determined to action through any incentive *except so far as the human being has incorporated it into his maxim*. . . . [O]nly in this way can an incentive, whatever it may be, coexist with the absolute spontaneity of the power of choice (freedom)" (emphasis original).

[23]Idem, *Practical Philosophy*, 166, 199, 89 (*AA* 5:33, 76; *AA* 4:40).

[24]Idem, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 104, 113–114 (*AA* 6:61–62, 73–74).

reconcilable[25] with the deeper structure of Kant's autonomous and timeless self. That there can be a new self (who makes the decision for good) emerging from the old (who has made the decision for bad) is the question. Kant surmises that the old and new are morally different persons that represent a legitimate transformation of the human being.[26] This change logically brings the inevitability of antecedent conditions to the self-determining apparatus of the self that is, the free will. This means that contingent states and actions in time (e.g., knowledge of right and wrong, fear, pangs of guilt, conviction, repentance) may have no effect on the supersensible self, as this would destroy its spontaneity. Kant is conjecturing a qualitative change of the supersensible self, where some pillars of his moral system do now allow. The character of the individual "must be a result of the timelessness of the choice of the supreme maxim," but in the change from evil to good, the only other logical way of conceiving this event—apart from divine aid or events in time—is that the *noumenal* "old man" must be, in some way, a prior determinant of the creation of the new.[27]

Kant's conversion account also contradicts the deep structure of his view of the transformation of the self in regards to the problem of radical evil. The radical evil that characterizes the moral disposition of the old self "corrupts the ground of all maxims" for action in time.[28] He claims that the human being brings about their good or evil disposition according to whether they absorb into their rule of conduct (maxim) the habitual desires of the original good predisposition that humanity was created with. But Kant does not explain how or why the evil self would make the movement for this change.[29] The evil self is irrevocably set in its moral direction and there is nothing good that can overpower and reverse this disposition so that it is capable of choosing the good. Furthermore, it cannot be determined by the good disposition which does not yet "exist." As Jacqueline Mariña observes, something mediate is missing that would allow an unadulterated (by evil), unconditioned choice to take place.[30] A third self, neither good nor evil, must be abstracted by Kant; yet this is also impossible because as Kant says the "disposition as regards the moral law is never indifferent."[31] Radical evil has corrupted the ground of all maxims, and it is inconceivable that a morally neutral self, lurking about in

[25]Kant must know that his explanation is insufficient when he says that the "reascent" from evil back to good is "no more comprehensible" than the fall from good to evil (ibid., 90 [*AA* 6:46]).

[26]Ibid., 114 (*AA* 6:74); see also Leslie A. Mulholland, "Freedom and Providence in Kant's Account of Religion: The Problem of Expiation," in *Kant's Philosophy of Religion Reconsidered*, ed. Philip J. Rossi & Michael Wreen (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 87.

[27]Ibid., 88.

[28]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 83 (*AA* 6:37).

[29]Ibid., 89 (*AA* 6:44).

[30]Jacqueline Mariña, "Kant on Grace: A Reply to His Critics," *RelS* 33.4 (1997): 87.

[31]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 73 (*AA* 6:24).

human nature with no duty to the law and without being externally placed there, exists. The idea of a self *qua* self without the moral law is inconceivable for Kant—even the opposing selves, good and evil, that Kant imagines in *Religion* are only considered as such because of their moral status. These puzzles and contradictions, as abstruse as they may seem, are incredibly important for Kant's ability to explain the removal of debt, because it is in the conversion of the old to the new self where the suffering requisite for satisfaction takes place.[32]

It is important to remember, at the risk of falling into indicting Kant with Pelagianism, that he admits the human inability to become good on their own, and he sees the logical contradiction of this and the freedom to do just the same without divine aid. This is, in Kant's view, an antinomy that is not reconcilable through theoretical reason's imagining external aid. Theoretical reason might posit a "divine merit not its own . . . preceding every good work,"[33] but human knowledge may not attain to knowledge of this to ground belief. Kant's bottom line is that practical reason can find no benefit for morality in allowing divine aid to be a factor in conversion.[34]

What Kant removes (divine aid) from conversion, he allows into his discussion of the moral self who has chosen the good disposition. There is little doubt, in spite of his own vacillations, that Kant thought divine aid, practically considered, *was possible* for the converted earnestly pursuing the *summum bonum*:

> [R]eason does not leave us altogether without comfort with respect to the lack of righteousness of our own (which is valid before God). Reason says that whoever does, in a disposition of true devotion to duty, as much lies within his power to satisfy his obligation (at least in a steady approximation toward complete conformity to the law), can legitimately hope that what lies outside his power will be supplemented by the supreme wisdom *in some way or other* (which can render permanent the disposition to this steady approximation).[35]

[32]Ibid., 113–114.

[33]Ibid., 148 (*AA* 6:117–118).

[34]For example, Kant writes in his general remark on grace in conversion that "Granted that supernatural cooperation is also needed to his becoming good or better, whether this cooperation only consist in the diminution of obstacles or be also a positive assistance, the human being must nonetheless make himself antecedently worthy of receiving it." Here Kant appears to allow grace into the event of conversion, but he qualifies this entire section by noting that what he has said is a "*parerga* to religion within the bounds of reason" that is to say, grace in conversion is not consistent with the use of practical reason (ibid., 89, 96 [*AA* 6:44, 52]).

[35]Ibid., 191 (*AA* 6:171). In "The Conflict of the Faculties," Kant's notion of grace after conversion is even more robust in that it is thought practically beneficial: "faith in this supplement for . . . deficiency is sanctifying, for only by it can man cease to doubt that he can reach his final aim (to become pleasing to God) and so lay hold of the courage and firmness of attitude he needs to lead a life pleasing to God." (idem, "The Conflict of the Faculties," in *Religion and Rational Theology*, 268 [*AA* 7:44]).

From this passage, found not in a *parerga*[36] and clearly referring to the self subsequent to conversion, one can see the inklings of an interplay between human initiative and divine aid, and further, that the individual has epistemic justification ("legitimate hope") for believing in this aid. Interestingly, when Kant says "our lack of righteousness," he is implying that what the individual may legitimately hope for is an alien righteousness. The context of this passage is that Kant is concerned that the self, despite its choice of the highest maxim and the good disposition, must still fall short of the *summum bonum*. The *noumenal* self upon conversion is no longer, by virtue of its good disposition, considered evil,[37] but actions in time by the sensible self, which flow from the good disposition, are deficient. As Kant explains,

> Even the purest moral disposition elicits in the human being, regarded as a worldly creature no more than the continuous becoming of a subject well pleasing to God in actions (such as can be met with in the world of senses). In quality (since it must be thought as supersensibly *grounded*) this disposition can indeed be, and ought to be, holy and conformable to the archetype's disposition. In degree, however, (in terms of its manifestations in actions) it always remains deficient and infinitely removed from that of the archetype.[38]

The deficiency, still evident in the sensible experience of the individual, will still disqualify the human being from the *summum bonum*, even though they have chosen the good disposition. By distinguishing between "quality," a reference to the supersensible self's good disposition, and "degree," which is a term denoting movement of the sensible self in its ongoing quest for moral perfection, Kant means to emphasize that the latter is a continual work-in-progress, while the former is already "there." The impediment to salvation for the human being still remains. The "infinite" deficiency must disqualify the human being from the *summum bonum*, even though they have chosen the good disposition, because the deeds do not always measure up to the disposition. Kant's solution is to make the good disposition stand in the place of the deficiencies in God's judgment. The good disposition is the supersensible ground of the actions in time, and God, who alone can apprehend the inscrutable *noumenal* self, sees the timeless unity of the individual's endless moral progress and judges them, at whatever point in their life after choosing the good disposition, based solely on their disposition, not on their temporal and permanent deficiencies.[39]

[36]I mention this because, as Barth notes, some of the positive affirmations Kant makes about grace are found within his "General Remarks," and these, he states, do not fit within the confines of moral reason (Karl Barth, *Protestant Thought: From Rousseau to Ritschl*, trans. Brian Cozens [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959], 187–188).

[37]Kant states "Nor can a human being be morally good in some parts, and at the same time evil in others. For if he is good in one part, he has incorporated the moral law into his maxim" (*Religion and Rational Theology*, 73).

[38]Ibid., 115n (*AA* 6:74–75).

[39]Kant writes, "How can this disposition count for the deed itself, when this deed is *every time* (not generally, but at each instant) defective? The solution rests on the

This discussion of supplemental (imputed) grace leads to a question, given that divine aid may be supposed to reside within the moral agent or external to it, about the nature and location of saving righteousness for Kant. He does, as mentioned earlier, seem to hold to the possibility of an alien righteousness. Karl Barth supports this point, explaining that, for Kant, "It is solely in the *idea*, known only to God, of the improved disposition, that justice can be done to eternal righteousness. It is this ideal righteousness, and not the righteousness of a disposition which we might find present within us! It will therefore always remain a righteousness which is not our own."[40]

By "idea" Barth is referring to the prototype, or archetype, which in Book 2 of *Religion* Kant employs as the guiding moral principle and force for atonement and conversion. Throughout his religious writings, Kant tiptoes delicately around the divine identity of Christ (a mystery to reason) revealed in Scripture. Earlier we saw that in conversion the "new man" takes on the disposition of the archetype, the "Son of God," including his sufferings, and this archetype implanted into the primordial reason of humanity, when acted upon during conversion, serves to satisfy sins committed. In *The Conflict of the Faculties*, Kant identifies the prototype with grace. His definition of grace here in this work greatly blurs the distinction between the moral subject and divine presence/action. The issue then becomes whether, and if so, how the "idea" can be considered an external righteousness. Barth's assessment does lend credence to the interpretation that, for Kant, the idea, or prototype, which exists in primordial human reason is external to humankind, and in this sense, an external righteousness, but he does not venture to explain how.[41]

Stephen Palmquist's recent assessment of the possibility of external righteousness is less conservative than Barth's. In his 2016 commentary on *Religion*, Palmquist interprets Kant as admitting a morally justified belief in

following: According to our mode of estimation, [to us] who are unavoidably restricted to temporal conditions in our conceptions of the relationship of cause to effect, the deed, as a continuous advance *in infinitum* from a defective good to something better, always remains defective, so that we are bound to consider the good as it appears to us, i.e., according to the *deed,* as *at each instant* inadequate to a holy law. But because of the *disposition* from which it derives and which transcends the senses, we can think of the infinite progression of the good toward conformity to the law as being judged by him who scrutinizes the heart (through his pure intellectual intuition) to be a perfected whole even with respect to the deed (the life conduct). And so notwithstanding his permanent deficiency, a human being can still expect to be *generally* well-pleasing to God, at whatever point in time his existence be cut short" (ibid., 109 [*AA* 6:68]).

[40]Barth, *Protestant Thought*, 183.

[41]Kant says that "grace is none other than the nature of the human being insofar as he is determined to actions by a principle which is intrinsic to his own being, but supersensible. . . . Since we want to explain this principle, although we know no further ground for it, we represent it as a stimulus to good produced in us by God, the predisposition to which we did not establish in ourselves, and so, as grace . . . grace, is the hope that good will develop in us—a hope awakened by belief in our original moral predisposition to good and by the example of humanity as pleasing to God in his son" (*Religion and Rational Theology*, 268 [*AA* 7:43]).

a God/man, an interpretation which quells any misgivings as to an external righteousness. In a careful analysis of book 2, Section 1/B (*AA* 6:66), Palmquist explains the following:

> The archetype is an *idea*, not an "ideal" (i.e., a transcendental object) so the "ideal of humanity" must refer neither to the archetype nor the historical Jesus, considered merely as a man, but to the God-man (i.e., in Christian tradition, *to the Christ*), considered as a transcendent object of faith. Therefore Kant's claim is that the *conviction* of a human being whose vicarious suffering was grounded in a total reliance on the archetype would be—Kant actually dares to say "is!"—"completely valid," not just for everyone on earth but for *all possible* human beings; this makes such a person the *prototype* (i.e., the first model) for imperfect human beings to emulate. Kant's (crucial) qualification is that such a belief in an ideal God-man as the representative of all humanity before God's "supreme righteousness" . . . retains its validity only "if" one who interprets Jesus' sufferings (for example) as an expression of the Christ is able to adopt a conviction similar to Jesus' (archetypal) conviction. In other words, those who aspire to be Christian must, through a commitment of practical faith, conform their own conviction to the archetype that is embedded within this ideal, thereby affirming the dominion of the good through a "righteousness that is not ours."[42]

Palmquist's reading of this passage is innovative and, if true, a windfall for Kant scholars advocating a positive, Protestant-oriented interpretation of Kant's concept of grace. An inductive study of both this passage and the larger section surrounding it (*AA* 6:60–66) reveals that Palmquist may be incorrect in identifying the "God-man" with the "ideal." Evidence that challenges Palmquist's interpretation is the initial paragraph where Kant describes him as the model of humanity, "the Word," and his origins as the "idea of him proceed[ing] from God" (*AA* 6:60). In the second paragraph, Kant calls the same the "ideal of moral perfection" and the "prototype." (*AA* 6:61) It appears that Kant might be referring to the same concept/entity in different ways in respect to its role or function in moral religion. Nevertheless, his reckoning of the "human model" with the "idea," ideal of humanity, and the prototype/archetype appears to discredit Palmquist's argument that the "ideal" is other than the "idea."[43]

Another key to interpreting this passage is where (just prior to the passage in question) Kant introduces the hypothetical nature ("Now if a human being

[42]Stephen Palmquist, *Comprehensive Commentary on Kant's Religion within the Bounds of Bare Reason* (New York: Wiley & Sons, 2016), 176–177. Cf. 176 (*AA* 6:60), "Now, such a conviction with all the sufferings taken upon oneself for the sake of the world's greatest good—as thought in the ideal of humanity—is completely valid, for all human beings, and at all times and in all worlds, before the supreme righteousness, if the human being makes, as he ought to do, his conviction (*die seinige*) similar to it. It will of course always remain a righteousness that is not ours insofar as this righteousness of ours would have to consist in a lifestyle completely and unfailingly in accordance with that conviction" (ibid., 176 [*AA* 6:66]).

[43]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 103 (*AA* 6:60).

of such a truly divine disposition had descended . . . from heaven to earth at a specific time . . .") of his discussion.[44] This fully-human teacher, because of his impeccable teaching and conduct and not because of any divine credentials, could rightly speak of himself as if the "ideal of goodness . . . [was] displayed incarnate in him." The disposition, "the purest one", or righteousness, of this human—not only his teachings and conduct, but also the sufferings undertaken for the good of the world—Kant claims could rightly be associated with each moral self who adopts this disposition and strives to emulate it in their own disposition. Yet, in spite of its adoption, it "will ever remain a righteousness which is not our own."[45] Is Kant bringing back the content of the Christian atonement of tradition, as Palmquist seems to say, even the doctrine of the imputation of divine righteousness made possible by the union of human and divine? It is doubtful that Palmquist's strict identification of the ideal as a God-man can be true because of the merely hypothetical nature of what Kant can assert under the parameters of his epistemology as well as the problem of terminology already mentioned. One thing that can be certain is Kant's agnostic bent toward much that is supernatural and revealed,[46] which, in this case, means theoretical knowledge of divinity in the ideal human is impossible. The divinity of Christ is also problematic for moral reasons. A model who is divine, and not merely human, is exceedingly harmful to the self's moral striving.[47]

A better interpretation of Kant's intent in this passage would be that, despite no way of knowing, speculatively or morally, if the ideal is also divine, such an ideal human, whose disposition reflects in the purest form the moral law, (as a divine being would) and who suffers for the highest good of the world, would consist of a righteousness that is "perfectly valid" for anyone who emulates this disposition. What remains unsaid in this interpretation is how one who is merely human, but has a divine disposition, can provide a "perfectly valid" source of righteousness for the world, and admittedly, this problem points back in favor of Palmquist's interpretation. Nevertheless, I agree with Barth's assertion that Kant intends that this righteousness is an external righteousness whose source is not the moral subject's own insomuch as an idea residing in humankind's rational faculty from the beginning can be considered an external righteousness.[48] Kant presumably believes he has provided epistemic justification for external righteousness when he says

[44]Ibid., 106 (*AA* 6:63).

[45]Ibid., 108 (*AA* 6:66).

[46]Ibid. Kant's agnosticism is observable more than once in the section. Notice the following example: "[H]ad he brought about, through all this, an incalculably great moral good in the world, through all this: even then we would have no cause to assume in him anything else except a naturally begotten human being. . . . Not that we would thereby absolutely deny that he might indeed also be a supernaturally begotten human being" (ibid., 106 [*AA* 6:63]).

[47]Ibid., 264–265 (*AA* 7:39).

[48]Barth, *Protestant Thought*, 183.

it "must be possible" to appropriate this righteousness, but this is only the case; and this is a consistent qualifier of Kant's, if one makes the movement to associate their own disposition with that of the prototype (i.e., makes themselves receptive to grace).[49]

Soteriological Innovation—Receptivity to Grace

The tenet that one must make themselves "receptive" to God's grace through free decision is troublesome for some, especially of the Protestant persuasion, who ascribe to a *sola fide* and/or forensic justification formula.[50] It is true that Kant's religion does not allow for grace before conversion (i.e., prevenient grace), since this would violate the free moral status of the self. But, after conversion, Kant allows for grace, in whatever inchoate form, as a necessity for reaching the *summum bonum*.[51]

Laying aside the obvious weakness in his theology of the omission of prevenient and cooperating grace,[52] Kant's teaching of the need to make oneself "receptive"[53] to grace does not prove as disgusting to Protestant Christian sensibilities as some might imagine. In fact, Kant is making a very logical point within his own system—one that, if viewed within a covenantal framework for justification, helps to explain the identity of justification as both an initial event and a dynamic process, what might be termed, "dynamic justification."[54]

[49]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 108 (*AA* 6:66).

[50]Alister McGrath recognizes that the Protestant Reformers created a disjunction between justification and regeneration, and it is precisely this disjunction that would make Protestants suspicious of Kant's notion of moral receptivity. See Alister McGrath, *A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 217.

[51]Wood argues to this end, using Kant's own *reduction ad absurdum practicum* argument that grace is a postulate of practical reason. Essentially, if one denies God, then one denies they can conceive the possibility of moral perfection; then they have denied the unconditioned component of the *summum bonum*; if one denies they can conceive the *summum bonum*, then they commit themselves to not obeying the moral law. This is practically absurd, and so Allen argues that grace is a necessary postulate (*Kant's Moral Religion*, 248).

[52]Kant does not seem to have any room for the illuminative and empowering work of the Holy Spirit in his moral system, which is consistent with his epistemology. He does not deem the Spirit as a person relevant to moral religion but as a manifestation of the teaching and conduct of Christ, which for moral reason is "contained" in the prototype (*AA* 7:59; *AA* 6:69). See also Mariña, "Kant on Grace," 385, 387.

[53]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 115 (*AA* 6:75). Kant's definition of grace includes the notion of moral receptivity. He writes that "*receptivity* is all that we, on our part, can attribute to ourselves, whereas a superior's decision to grant a good for which the subordinate has no more than (moral receptivity) is called *grace*.

[54]On the concept of dynamic justification, see, for example the undated journal article by Robert Brinsmead, "The Dynamic, Ongoing Nature of Justification by Faith," *Present Truth* 18 (n.d.): 20, 22, http://presenttruthmag.com/archive/

Kant is motivated in his insistence on moral "receptivity" by two things. First, he is concerned that a belief in grace is morally harmful to human beings. It promotes a dangerous confidence in the moral subject due to a supposed, but unknown, foreign power. This may lead the moral self into an inertial state of thinking where it expects from above "what we ought to be seeking within us."[55] A second reason for the necessity for "receptivity" comes from Kant's respect for the transcendence and sovereignty of God as it is expressed in the concept of immutability and atemporality. God's actions are conceived in eternity, and thus, since God cannot be said to respond (without using an anthropomorphism), his actions in time are unilateral. Kant also holds that grace is not particular in aim, but universal.[56] Grace then is comparable to an eternally derived "shower" which God "pours out" in time on humanity, but which is not received without the moral volition of the creature. In his *Lectures on the Philosophical Doctrine of Religion*, Kant explains the following:

> [I]t is anthropomorphic to represent God as able to be gracious after he was previously wrathful. For this would posit an alteration in God. But God is and remains always the same, equally gracious and equally just. *It depends only on us whether we will become objects of his grace or of his punitive justice* [emphasis supplied]. The alteration, therefore, goes on *within us*; it is the relation in which we stand to God which is altered whenever we improve ourselves.[57]

It is clear from the above passage that Nicholas Wolterstoff's charge that Kant's "receptivity" doctrine renders God as "required to forgive" is false.[58] What Kant is actually saying by "receptivity" is that human beings must place themselves under the "stream" of the eternally generated "shower" of God's grace, and the only means by which they may do this is by choosing the good moral disposition and living by their self-chosen good maxims. As Mariña explains, "it is not our adoption of a good disposition that is the condition of God's [gracious] action upon us . . . but that rather, our adoption of such a disposition is the condition of *our ability to be receptive of and recognize God's grace*, which is ever present."[59] This argument may be qualified somewhat by Kant's statement in *Religion* that seems to describe a sequential interplay

---

PTM%2018%20Radical%20Nature%20of%20JBF.pdf, where he approvingly interprets Luther that justification by faith is a "dynamic, ongoing action in the divine-human relationship. . . . Justification is not static, it is dynamic and ongoing. As we *constantly* believe, God *constantly* justifies" (emphasis original).

[55]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 109, 207 (*AA* 6:68, 191–192).

[56]Mulholland, "Freedom and Providence," 80–81.

[57]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*. 379–380 (*AA* 28:1039).

[58]Wolterstorff, "Conundrums," 44–45. Kant wrote in response to Wolterstorff, "For what in our earthly life (and perhaps even in all future times and in all worlds) is always only in mere *becoming* . . . is imputed to us as if we already possessed it here in full. And to this we indeed have no rightful claim (according to the empirical cognition we have of ourselves), so far as we know ourselves" (*Religion and Rational Theology*, 115–116 [*AA* 6:75–76]).

[59]Mariña, "Kant on Grace," 381.

of human and divine where God "first sees their moral constitution . . . and only then makes up for their incapacity to satisfy this requirement on their own." However, this latter passage should be understood as descriptive next to the larger metaphysical context of Kant's doctrine of God, where God is the unilateral cause of a universal grace.[60]

Wolterstoff's other criticism is that Kant destroys divine freedom in requiring forgiveness. If Kant is right that God is not free, that would extirpate grace as unmerited favor (a gift). Wolterstorff thinks that God's actions in this case would be stemming from his justice, not from grace. Kant cannot hold, he asserts, that God's divine aid is both a duty and a freely given gift.[61] Kant's method, as Wolterstorff sees it, consists of "probing the implications of our human rights and obligations" and holding God to the same human world of moral obligations.[62] But in his rejoinder, Wolterstorff also draws on the empirical evidence of human relationships, arguing that "if we have a moral claim on someone's doing something, then for that person to do that is not for the person to act graciously, but for the person to grant what is due us."[63]

Wolterstorff is correct that divine forgiveness is motivated by divine love, but in the divine act of mercy he claims that divine mercy transcends divine justice in the act of forgiveness. This is counterintuitive to both classical theological and biblical concepts: of God as containing the fullness of all perfections and incapable of change, and of God as a merciful judge who is also just in His justification of sinners through the satisfaction made by the Son.[64]

Kant, for his part, adheres to the classical understanding of divine perfections and maintains that God is "always the same, equally gracious and equally just."[65] Compared with Wolterstorff, for Kant, divine justice does not trump benevolence. In his *Lectures*, he writes that God's justice is a perfection "that limits God's benevolence," not in God's nature, but "only in the measure we have not made ourselves worthy of it." With this dialectical tension of the perfections of divine grace and justice, Kant is able to speak of divine justice in terms of a "combination of benevolence with holiness." Thus, Wolterstorff's charge that Kant "requires God to forgive" because he shortchanges divine grace in favor of justice is suspect.[66]

[60]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 115 (*AA* 6:75).

[61]Wolterstorff, "Conundrums," 44–45. In comparison, Kant expressly states that God's gifts do not flow from his justice, "for if they came to us from justice, then there would be no *praemia gratuita* [gifts of grace], but rather we would have to possess some right to demand them, and God would have to be bound to give them to us" (*Religion and Rational Theology*, 417 [*AA* 28:1085]).

[62]Wolterstorff, "Conundrums," 44, 47.

[63]Ibid., 44.

[64]Ibid., 46.

[65]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 379–380 (*AA* 28:1039).

[66]Ibid., 410 (*AA* 28:1076).

As to Wolterstorff's assertion that for God's grace to actually be grace it must be free,[67] this seems self-evident enough under the normal conditions of human relationships—assuming divine relationships are analogous to these. But his claim that Kant diminishes divine freedom belies a simplistic view of divine freedom on his own part, at least when divine freedom is considered in relation to a covenantal framework for the understanding of justification.[68]

In a covenantal framework for justification, God calls the sinner from where they are to a new life, but with specific stipulations that must be subsequently observed (cf. Abraham). When the sinner embarks on this new life, a new relationship with God, the perpetuation of their relationship with God is both founded in grace and necessarily contingent on their moral growth as it expresses their trust in God. Supposing the new creature commits a sin, or, supposing that the good works the new creature performed with good conscience are still deficient to meet the demands of the law, the question at issue is whether God is legally required (as Wolterstorff charges Kant with holding) to forgive/impute righteousness. The very nature of the covenant, in that it is founded on promise, indicates that by virtue of God's holy nature (commensurate with the law) and His inability to lie, God will forgive. In this covenant framework, it does indeed appear that God is morally bound, albeit by His own free choice, and perhaps paradoxically, because of the eternal claims of the law which are commensurate with his character, to forgive.[69]

All of this is, of course, contingent on the sinners' decision to make themselves "receptive" to God's grace through repentance and confession; or, in the case of an individual whose has performed good but deficient works, have done their best to fulfill God's law. In this covenantal scenario, divine freedom is still intact, but through the divine act of initiating a covenant and entering the relationship, God has freely chosen to limit Himself to some obligations. It is fascinating that Kant seems aware, to some degree, of this covenantal framework. In *The Conflict of the Faculties*, Kant articulates an objection to his grounding belief in divine supplementation on moral reason instead of a revealed, covenantal framework.

> To believe that God, by an act of kindness, will in some unknown way fill what is lacking to our justification is to assume gratuitously a cause that will satisfy the need we feel . . . for when we expect something by grace of

[67]Ibid., 379 (*AA* 28:1039).

[68]Rhys Bezzant recognizes how a covenant (in this case Edwards's) impacts discourse on divine and human responsibility in justification: "The language of covenant serves to create a framework connecting holy demands with justified status, just as it gives objective ballast to the experience of faith and grace: it situates the experience of salvation within a biblical and historical framework" ("The Gospel of Justification and Edwards Social Vision," in *Jonathan Edwards and Justification*, ed. Josh Moody [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012], 79).

[69]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 231 (*AA* 8:339). In "The End of All Things" Kant also recognizes the claims of the law on God, stating that "the law, as an unchanging order lying in the nature of things, is not to be left up to even the creator's arbitrary will, to decide its consequences thus or otherwise" (ibid.).

> a superior, we cannot assume that we must get it as a matter of course; we can expect it only if it was actually promised to us, as in a formal contract. So it seems that we can hope for that supplement and assume that we shall get it only insofar as it has been actually pledged through divine *revelation*.[70]

Kant's embedded objector claims that a legitimate hope in justifying grace may be gained from the promises of God made in the form of a contract. Though Kant himself would not accept revealed knowledge as grounds for belief in divine aid, he understands on some level how grace in a covenant framework might work. What he does not realize, as far as we find here, is that the notion of the moral agent's "receptivity" as a condition of grace (imputed righteousness) after conversion is a necessary cog in the covenantal framework of the interplay of God and the human agent in justification.[71]

Summary and Remarks

Kant's subjective atonement fails in explaining expiation in at least three ways. He fails to explain how debt may be removed by one phase of the moral self-rendering satisfaction for another. His failure in this aspect comes about because of a contradiction in the structure of the *noumenal* self as absolutely free and spontaneous and in his insistence that the *noumenal* self actuate its own transformation. Finally, he does not adequately explain how the permanence of the evil disposition, which has chosen its maxims, can change these without some condition that is able to overcome the disposition to evil and to choose the good.

In terms of the possibility and identity of grace, Kant cannot allow grace into the conversion event. The overriding reason for this is that it would violate the autonomous freedom of moral agents, who must choose for themselves good or evil to be moral agents. For the same reason, cooperative grace, during or after conversion, is not beneficial to moral progress. These points must be qualified by the fact that Kant would also say that grace in these forms cannot be denied—they are simply not objects of knowledge.

[70]Ibid., 271 (*AA* 7:47).

[71]The notion of Kantian "receptivity" along with some of the same terminology (i.e., "disposition," "deficiency"), can be found in a covenantal context in the devotional writings of nineteenth/early twentieth century author, Ellen White, who wrote, "Those who with sincere will, with contrite heart, are putting forth humble efforts to live up to the requirements of God are looked upon by the Father with pitying tender love; He regards such as obedient children, and the righteousness of Christ is imputed unto them" (Ellen G. White to Elders M. and H. Miller, 23 July 1889, (Letter 4, 1889), Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Springs, MD, in idem, *The Ellen G. White 1888 Materials*, 4 vols. [Washington, DC: Ellen G. White Estate, 1987], 1:402); "When it is in the heart to obey God, when efforts are put forth to this end, Jesus accepts this disposition and effort as man's best service, and He makes up for the deficiency with His own divine merit. But He will not accept those who claim to have faith in Him, and yet are disloyal to His Father's commandment" (idem, *Selected Messages*, 3 vols. [Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1958], 1:382).

The transformation to the good disposition allows for a legitimate hope in divine aid to make up for inevitable deficiency. But this is only on the condition that the moral agents make themselves "receptive" to grace. On this point, Kant is "most original"[72] as a corrective to forensic notions of justification following the Protestant reformation and in pointing to a dynamic view of justification. The identity of this supplement is an idea of righteousness located in the original, created predisposition of humanity by God, and thus, technically external.

Kant famously said in his first critique that his efforts to limit knowledge were intended to "make room for faith."[73] Recognizing the limits of one's knowledge is an invaluable skill in any field of knowledge, but in theology it is paramount because the subject of study is chiefly a transcendent God. Kant's approach to religion, then, is not wholly without merit, for it restrains speculation that can be harmful to individual and corporate faith.

Kant's pursuit to justify belief in personal salvation ineluctably places him face-to-face with the mystery of atonement, and his caution serves him well in grappling with this mystery if we take into consideration his view of knowledge as scientific certainty. However, without revealed content, Kant struggles decidedly to make sense of rudimentary principles of Christian faith that have shaped the faith of believers across ages. He wrestles with profound questions on atonement that, in summary, leave him with a "remarkable antinomy" of faith in satisfaction and faith in the ability to become well-pleasing to God.[74] He attempts to solve this by considering what is most beneficial to morality and by studiously avoiding, for the sake of intellectual honesty, what cannot be known by speculative reasoning. Some scholars argue that he fails to resolve it.[75]

From the perspective of revealed faith, Kant's religious project may indeed provide some justification for belief, say, for instance, in the argument for God's existence, freedom, and a life of holiness and future happiness all inextricably linked to the duty to obey the law (cf. Rom 1:20). However, Kant's insistence on autonomy severs the self from its maker, and his imperative of divine grace is, in many instances, an obscure wish at best. Rather than securing infallible grounds for belief, this evaluation of Kant's encounter with the mystery of atonement finds him returning his interpreter back again to the gulf between God and sinful humankind.

His failure need not be taken completely as such, however. Instead, it may also be seen as an affirmation of the paradoxical nature of the atonement—both to the theoretical and the practical uses of reason. The paradoxical character of the atonement, it may be argued, is one of the greatest arguments for its truth and is evidence to support belief. For, if one may legitimately hope that divine aid is available to bridge the gulf between

[72]Mariña, "Kant on Grace," 400.

[73]Kant, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, 117 (B, xxx).

[74]Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 147 (*AA* 6:116).

[75]Silber, "Kant's Religion," cxxxii. See also Wolterstorff, "Conundrums," 48–52.

them and God, it is reasonable to conclude that, as grace is the action of one whose being, knowledge, and power exceeds cognition, such aid should be ultimately beyond human comprehension.[76]

[76]See C. Stephen Evans, *Why Christian Faith Still Makes Sense: A Response to Contemporary Challenges* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 104–113. Evans makes a similar argument about paradox as an apologetic tool in regards to revelation and the incarnation.

Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 54, No. 2, 333–348.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST APPROACHES TO OTHER RELIGIONS: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS FROM 1930–1950, PART I

Andrew Tompkins
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Seventh-day Adventists have been involved in worldwide mission efforts since the 1870s. By the 1890s the Seventh-day Adventist Church had turned worldwide mission into a major focus to "reach the world" with the three angels' message.[1] As a result of this worldwide push it was inevitable that Adventists would begin encountering other religions in the Middle East, Southern Asia, Southeastern Asia, and throughout Africa. Much like the Christians who had preceded them by nearly a decade, this was a time of shock and bewilderment. Often the missionaries retreated from these encounters and relegated themselves to engaging with other Christian denominations.[2]

The developments, trends, and trajectories of Adventist approaches to world religions have been largely left untold.[3] How has the church reached

[1]For more on these early years of Adventist mission, see Bruce L. Bauer, "Congregational and Mission Structures and How the Seventh-day Adventist Church Has Related to Them" (DMiss diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1982); Borge Schantz, "The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Missionary Thought: Contemporary Appraisal" (PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1983); Stefan Höschele, *From the End of the World to the Ends of the Earth: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Missiology* (Nürnberg: Verlag für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, 2004).

I am indebted to the following people for taking the time to read through both Parts I and II (forthcoming) of this article and give their critical feedback: Bruce Bauer, Richard McEdward, Jerald Whitehouse, Stefan Höschele, Pat Gustin, Bruce Moyer, and Lester Merklin. I am also indebted to Boubakar Sanou, who allowed me to work on this project as part of an assignment in his course on World Religions.

[2]Baldur Ed Pfeiffer points out that often early Adventist missionaries in the Middle East worked only among ex-patriot workers and avoided the local populace; see *The European Seventh-day Adventist Mission in the Middle East 1879–1939*, European University Studies 161 (Frankfurt: Lang, 1981), 49–53.

[3]There are a few brief works that are relevant to this study. See Stefan Höschele, "The Emerging Adventist Theology of Religions Discourse: Participants, Positions, Particularities," in *A Man of Passionate Reflection: A Festschrift Honoring Jerald Whitehouse*, ed. Bruce L. Bauer (Berrien Springs, MI: Department of World Mission, Andrews University, 2011), 355–376; idem, *Interchurch and Interfaith Relations: Seventh-day Adventist Statements and Documents*, Advenftistica 10 (Frankfurt: Lang, 2010); Richard McEdward, "A Brief Overview of Adventist Witness among Muslims," in *A Man of Passionate Reflection: A Festschrift Honoring Jerald Whitehouse*, ed. Bruce L. Bauer (Berrien Springs, MI: Department of World Mission, Andrews University, 2011), 237–252; Gary Krause, "Adventism among the World Religions," in *A Man of Passionate Reflection: A Festschrift Honoring Jerald Whitehouse*, ed. Bruce L. Bauer (Berrien Springs, MI: Department of World Mission, Andrews University, 2011), 225–236. Krause's study skips over the period covered in this article.

its current understandings and approaches to other religions? What role has the wider Christian world played in influencing Adventist approaches? What can be learned from the past encounters with other religions? These are all questions that this two-part article moves toward answering.

Because Adventist international mission did not get started until the late nineteenth century, this study will begin to survey Adventist approaches to other religions from the 1930s onwards. While there would be a great deal of value in looking at Adventist approaches in the years prior to 1930, this study is focused on the more mature Adventist approaches. One reason for this is that because the other religions were so different and new for the Adventist missionaries, Adventist thinking prior to the 1930s lacks the depth it would gain with time. Slowly this would change, and by the 1930s Adventists had forty or more years to develop their understandings and approaches to other religions. In the wider Christian world this was also an important time in the understandings and approaches to other religions.

The aim of this study is related to the three questions noted above. Firstly, it is to help create a more accurate understanding of the historical developments of Christian approaches to other religions. This is important in that it can create a more informed attitude toward the current approaches the church is involved in. There is no doubt that the church has faced major tensions connected with the understandings and approaches toward other religions that some leaders have taken. Understanding the historical developments may help to ease the tension by showing the progression behind the current approaches.

Secondly, it is valuable to understand how Adventists have been influenced by the wider Christian movement. It is the assumption of some that Adventists are unaffected by the wider Christian movement in theology and mission. This study will test that type of thinking in the area of mission and other religions. This can aid the church in understanding better the Adventist Church's relation to other Christians, as well as help to isolate some of the areas where the Adventist Church has been influenced most and where it may have taken the lead.

Thirdly, it has been noted by many historians, both secular and religious, that history often contains important lessons that can be of value in understanding present challenges.[4] This study will attempt to highlight some important elements in the historical approaches of Adventists to other religions which can be informative for the church today.

The scope of this study is specifically related to world religions, and in order to delimit the study even more, it is focused on Adventist approaches to Muslims, Hindus, and Buddhists.

The main resources utilized in this study were primary documents (books, periodicals, meeting minutes, etc.) from the time period relevant to the study. One of the main databases utilized was the website of the Office of

[4]For a succinct explanation of the importance of studying mission history, see Paul E. Pierson, *The Dynamics of Christian Mission: History Through Missiological Perspective* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 2009), 11–13.

Archives, Statistics, and Research at the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.[5] Word searches were conducted in major Adventist periodicals, such as *Ministry*, *Review and Herald*, and other denominational papers from that archive. Terms such as Islam/Mohammedan/Muslim, Hindu/Hinduism, and Buddhist/Buddhism were the main search terms. Other books, MA theses, and doctoral dissertations were also consulted.

The Historical Context

By the 1930s most Protestant denominations had been involved in global missions for more than one hundred years. They had been encountering other religious groups for the duration of this time; therefore Protestants had published much on the topic of other religions by the 1930s. In the decades leading up to 1930 there had been major trends in theological thinking that built on the theory of evolution. Out of this came theological understandings of other religions that have been labelled as fulfillment theologies. These viewed other religions aside from Christianity as lower forms of religion that contained elements of truth that needed to be dug out and cleaned off. Then they could be "fulfilled" in Christianity, which is what they were evolving toward. The famous Edinburgh mission conference of 1910 was influenced by these views held by a number of influential missionaries.[6]

Fulfilment theology, while not necessarily representing the majority of missionaries during the early part of the century, was rapidly becoming more and more popular. It had its roots in certain theologians who, as mentioned above, worked under the influence of the evolutionary theory in vogue at the time. They also worked within the worldview of Western progress and "civilization" that was being spread around the world. J. N. Farquhar's major work, *The Crown of Hinduism*, first published in 1913, is often recognized as the most advanced and thought-out exposition of fulfilment theology.[7] This work would continue to have an impact, as would the basic fulfilment theology method, for many years to come.[8]

[5]General Conference Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research. "Online Archives," https://www.documents.adventistarchives.org.

[6]For a very helpful study on this, see Kenneth Cracknell, *Justice, Courtesy and Love: Theologians and Missionaries Encountering World Religions, 1846–1914* (London: Epworth, 1995). There were also some Seventh-day Adventist representatives at Edinburgh 1910. For more on this, see Keith A. Francis, "Ecumenism or Distinctiveness? Seventh-day Adventist Attitudes to the World Missionary Conference of 1910," in *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, ed. R. N. Swanson, SCH 32 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 477–487.

[7]J. N. Farquhar, *The Crown of Hinduism* (London: Oxford University Press, 1913). For more on the life of Farquhar, see Eric J. Sharpe, *Not to Destroy But to Fulfil: The Contribution of J. N. Farquhar to Protestant Missionary Thought in India before 1914*, Studia Missionalia Upsaliensia 5 (Uppsala, Sweden: Swedish Institute of Missionary Research, 1965).

[8]In India this model continued to be utilized by many Indian Christian theologians. It has since been revived by a few current mission thinkers such as

As Europe was engulfed in World War I, many of the high ideals of progressive thinkers were shattered by the reality that the West was not really evolving toward a utopian future. This had its repercussions for missions as well, and more specifically for the understanding of other world religions. Prior to World War I many Christians believed other religions were dying out and would eventually be eclipsed by the more "civilized" Christianity the missionaries were propagating.[9] However, it was beginning to become clearer that these religions were not going away. In fact, in many cases, they were actually going through periods of renaissance and renewal that would make them stronger than ever.

At the Jerusalem Mission council of 1928 another consensus view emerged that was heavily influenced by W. E. Hocking. The council consensus statement recognized much value in other religions, even going so far as to say that the spiritual value found in other religions, including "secular civilization," were part of "the one Truth."[10] Hocking later authored a major study on missions which included several chapters dealing with other religions. His primary conclusion, in consultation with a number of other theologians and mission workers of the time, was that all religions should work together to move the world toward a more peaceful existence.[11] This became a seminal work that garnered a number of reactions over the next several years.

At the same time a larger group of missionaries maintained a view that had survived for many centuries. They believed that other religions were satanic

---

Richard Leroy Hivner and Ivan M. Satyavrata, with nuances that separate it from the early twentieth-century works, although both Hivner and Satyavrata draw from those earlier works. See Richard Leroy Hivner, "The Christian Society for the Study of Hinduism, 1940–1956: Interreligious Engagement in Mid-twentieth Century India," (PhD diss., University of South Africa, 2011); Ivan M. Satyavrata, *God Has Not Left Himself without Witness* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011).

[9]For an example of the type of language being utilized in relation to mission and world evangelization prior to World War I, see World Missionary Conference 1910, *Report of Commission I: Carrying the Gospel to all the Non-Christian World* (New York: Revell, 1910), 1–49. For more on the change from language of triumphalism to more sober reality concerning the world and mission after World War I, see Andrew F. Walls, "Commission One and the Church's Transforming Century," in *Edinburgh 2010: Mission Then and Now*, ed. David A. Kerr and Kenneth R. Ross (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 30–32; Kosuke Koyama, "Commission One After a Century of Violence: The Search for a Larger Christ," in ibid., 41–52.

[10]International Missionary Council, *The Christian Life and Message in Relation to Non-Christian Systems*, vol. 1 of *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council, March 24–April 8, 1928* (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), 491. I am indebted to David J. Bosch for leading me to this quotation. For more on the importance of this council, see David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Mission Theology*, 20th anniversary ed., American Society of Missiology Series 16 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2011), 473.

[11]William E. Hocking, *Re-thinking Missions: A Laymen's Inquiry after 100 Years* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932).

and thus needed to be removed completely and replaced by Christianity. This was the predominant view of Christianity, although by the 1930s was becoming more tempered by the reality that other religions were neither as bad as once thought nor were they disappearing.

In 1938 a major world mission's conference was held in Madras, India, known as the Tambaram conference.[12] Probably the most important enduring legacy of this conference was the book *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* by Hendrik Kraemer.[13] He forcefully presented a view heavily influenced by the neo-orthodoxy of the day. In this work Kraemer argued that all religion was negative in that it could not accurately express the revelation of God. He critiqued fulfillment theology with his own argument for a radical break from other religions. He did see some hints of truth in other religions but these were dramatically eclipsed, in his view, by the work of Christ.[14]

Kraemer's book was like a bombshell in the world of Christian missions and it garnered numerous reactions both positive and negative.[15] It was in many ways a clear and concise view of other religions that would change the conversation from that point forward. This was the culmination of many years of thinking and debating the issue of other religions as they related to Christianity among Protestant denominations.

The divide between modern liberal theology and fundamental conservative theology had also taken its toll by the 1930s. Many Christians found themselves confronted with a choice to join one of these two competing ideologies. This impacted mission as well. Hocking wrote that missions, as it had been understood up until the 1930s, was no longer appropriate.

[12]The conference received mixed reviews from Adventists. There were no Adventists invited to the conference, so their reactions were purely from an outside view. For samples of negative reactions, see R. B. Thurber, "International Missionary Conference," *Ministry* 12.4 (1939): 14–15; "The World Missionary Conference," *The Oriental Watchman Herald of Health* 15.2 (1939): 36–37. For a more positive assessment, see E. D. Thomas, "No Time to Lose," *Eastern Tidings* 35.13 (1 July 1940): 4–5.

[13]The one reference to this book in Adventist literature is very positive. In 1948, W. P. Bradley—who at the time was an Associate Vice President of the General Conference—said about the book: "It seems that it would be a good book to have in our college libraries and also available to our leading missionaries abroad" (W. P. Bradley, "Gleanings," *Eastern Tidings* 43.2 [15 January 1948]: 8). This lends credence to the trend in Adventism to move more towards an exclusivistic understanding towards other religions.

[14]Hendrik Kraemer, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1938). For more on Kraemer's missiological and theological development leading up to Tambaram, see Carl F. Hallencreutz, *Kraemer towards Tambaram* (Uppsala, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1966).

[15]Some of these reactions were published in the first volume of the Tambaram Madras Series. See International Missionary Council, *The Authority of the Faith: International Missionary Council Meeting at Tambaram, Madras*, Tambaram Series 1 (London, Oxford University Press, 1939).

Ecumenical movements were moving away from the mission focus that they had begun with. As a result many fundamentalists began moving away from the mainline Protestant groups.

The wider Christian attitudes toward other religions by the 1940s had grown more and more complex with a wide variety of views being discussed. While it is beyond the scope of this study to go into the historical backgrounds in depth, it is important to keep in mind that this was a time of foment and change in many ways, including how other religions were understood.

Seventh-day Adventists, on the other hand, had only about forty years of mission encounters with world religions to reflect on. In many ways the Adventist Church was playing catch-up with the wider Christian movement. The next section will focus on the Adventist approach to other religions.

Seventh-day Adventists and World Religions: 1930–1950

While the wider Christian world was engaging in debates on whether or not mission was still a valid enterprise, the Adventist Church was heavily engaged in mission and developing its early approaches to other religions. Through the first four to five decades of Adventist mission there were some engagements with other religions, but these were limited. Studies on the beginnings of Adventist mission outside of the United States from the 1870s onward have noted that much of the focus in mission was on working among other Christians. This would remain the norm for most of the decades leading up to the time period of this study. Bruce Bauer and Borge Schantz both wrote doctoral dissertations that attempt to show some of the key developments of Adventist mission from the late nineteenth century into the early part of the twentieth.[16] These studies shed some light on the lack of approaches to other religions during this time period. The 1930s reveal a shift in this general trend, with more emphasis being placed on other religions.

Organizing the data gathered in this research posed a difficult challenge, because of the wide variety of sources and concepts being gleaned over this period. As a result the following sections are divided into three primary categories: (1) key moments and events, (2) key people, and (3) general trends. These three categories will be dealt with in order, the first category in Part I and the last two in Part II of this article series.

Key Moments and Events

In 1923, W. K. Ising, formerly an Adventist missionary in Palestine, made an extensive trip around the Middle East and then wrote a book detailing the trip. This book was published by the Pacific Press Publishing Association with the title *Among the Arabs*. The preface reads, "We learn much about the Arabs and their customs and mode of living, with a little of the Jews and Christians. The experiences given are fresh and first-hand. . . . The little book is interesting, informative, even apart from the better story, that Arabian

[16]See Bauer, "Congregational and Mission Structures;" Borge Schantz, "Development."

hearts are open to the blessed life-giving gospel."[17] This was, in many ways, the beginning of a very fruitful and thought-changing time for Adventist missions in the Middle East. Ising would become a strong supporter of more focused ministries and mission to Muslims in the coming years. The book itself contains very little about mission; in many ways it was simply a travelogue, more like an ethnographic manuscript than a mission book. But this was indicative of the times; Adventist missionaries were beginning to sense the wider religious world in a new way, and in many cases all they could do was describe what they were seeing.

While this is not necessarily a major moment in the history of Adventist approaches to other religions, it does serve to illustrate what many Adventist missionaries were doing at that time. Miss V. C. Chilton, an Adventist missionary in India, wrote a similar book, only with more narratives, about India entitled *The Sigh of the Orient*, which came out the same year.[18] Adventist missionaries were being confronted with worldviews that they were totally unfamiliar with and unready for. As a result all they could do at first was attempt to understand these adherents of other religions and report on them. Many of the early Adventist periodical articles that deal with other religions are nothing more than mere descriptors of these "strange" religions.

This type of travelogue reporting would continue for a number of years. Even as late as 1948 Francis D. Nichol took an "air journey" around the world to learn about the "Adventist mission activities and the customs, habits, and daily life of the people of Europe, the Middle East, Egypt and Ethiopia."[19] These travelogues are important because they were, in many ways, the only way the average Adventist member in North America and Europe would encounter other religions. But by the 1930s Adventists were also beginning to think more carefully about other religions from a mission standpoint.

The Biennial Council of the South Asia Division: 1932–1933

In Poona, India, from 30 December 1932 to 8 January 1933, a council was held, with attendees from all over the Southern Asia Division of Seventh-day Adventists. This council was attended by M. E. Kern, Associate Secretary of the General Conference. He wrote a couple of articles that came out in the *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* several months after the council, that reveal some of the major issues the division was facing in relation to other religions.

In the issue of the *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* that was published on 8 June 1933, Kern gave an overview of the council. In this overview he used the following language to describe the challenges faced by

[17]W. K. Ising, *Among the Arabs* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1924), 5–6.

[18]V. C. Chilton, *The Sigh of the Orient* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1924). Most of the chapters of this book are biographical narratives meant to help the reader better understand the cultural setting of India.

[19]Francis D. Nichol, *Letters from Far Lands* (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1948), cover page.

missionaries in India at this time: "If ever a group of workers needed wisdom and power from God, it is those who day by day face the indifference and self-satisfaction of Buddhism, the ignorance and superstition of Hinduism, and the militant bigotry of Mohammedanism."[20] This was not very complementary language and in many ways did not reflect the actual discussions that took place at the council as will be shown below. What it does demonstrate is the predominate understanding that Adventist leaders held concerning other religions at this time.

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald issue that was published the following week on 15 June 1933 gave a much more detailed description of the proceedings. This was also written by Kern, but with less colorful commentary and more reporting. The article says that "once a day . . . the workers discussed problems of the work . . . such problems as: 'How to Present Christianity to Hindus, Mohammedans, and Buddhists,' . . . 'Studying the Language, Religious Beliefs, and Customs of the People,' . . . 'Requirements Concerning the Giving Up of Previous Customs and Habits.'"[21] The challenge of engaging with other religions took center stage at this Division council.

Several discussions held at this council were often on topics related to other religions. For example, the question of what to do with married women who were devout followers of Jesus but whose husbands were either Muslim or Hindu? They could not be baptized openly so how should the church proceed to minister to them? No final conclusions are given in the article, leading the reader to believe that the challenge was obvious but the solutions were difficult.[22]

There were two other issues that were of even more prominence in the meetings and received more space in the article published on the 15 June 1933 and a subsequent article. The first was a controversial topic on what should be required of new converts, who came from other religious backgrounds. R. E. Loasby, another important figure in this research, led out in this discussion. Loasby made the astute observation that "some Western forms and methods as applied to the work of the Christian religion, are not altogether adapted to India. It is suggested, therefore, that Indian and Oriental customs be interfered with in as restricted a degree as is consistent with the faithful maintenance of Bible standards. To Christianize does not necessarily mean to Westernize."[23] Loasby went on to describe some local

[20]M. E. Kern, "Southern Asia Division Biennial Council," *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 110.23 (8 June 1933): 17. Future references to the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* will be abbreviated with *AR*. This overview article does include one other interesting fact: according to Kern, the periodical *The Oriental Watchman* did not have a large readership at this time, but of the subscribers it did have "60 percent" of the them were "non-Christian" (ibid., 18). This, of course, would be very difficult to verify.

[21]M. E. Kern, "Southern Asia Division Roundtable Discussions," *AR* 110.24 (15 June 1933): 9.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid., 10.

practices he felt were contrary to biblical standards but also listed other practices, such as the wearing of jewelry that signified marriage, that he felt should be allowed. In many ways Loasby held views different from his fellow Adventists in this regard, and much of his advice went unheeded.[24]

In the subsequent issue of the *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* that was published on 22 June 1933, M. E. Kern published a follow up article on the council. This article was focused on the discussions pertaining to other religions, namely Hinduism, Islam, and Buddhism. L. G. Mookerjee led out in the discussions on Hindus. His grandfather had been a Hindu before becoming a Christian many years earlier. Mookerjee pointed out that one of the key points that needed emphasis in working with Hindus was their lack of a solution for sin. He also pointed out that Christian behavior was the main problem getting in the way of Hindus joining the church.[25]

F. H. Loasby, brother of R. E., led out in the discussions on Islam. Loasby stated that he did not have the answers on how best to reach Muslims, but he did know one way "whereby it can *not* be done (emphasis in original)."[26] He proceeded to advise people to avoid any type of argumentative approach, and even described a public debate he participated in that turned out very badly. At the same time he was adamant that it was necessary to "study Islam, its history and progress." Apparently, according to F. H. Loasby, "there are those who deprecate the idea of studying these religions." But F. H. Loasby continues by saying, "how any man can possibly be considered competent to work for the Mussulman unless he makes an earnest study of Islam, is to me, frankly, a mystery."[27] He also spoke out strongly against saying anything negative about Muhammad or the Qur'an in order to avoid unnecessary conflict.[28]

F. A. Wyman was the lead voice in the discussion on Buddhism, but this discussion was less concrete than either the Hindu or Islam discussions had been. For the most part, Buddhists were portrayed as an extremely challenging group with which to work; success among them was lacking, and probably should not even be hoped for. Wyman did attempt to list some similarities between the Christianity and Buddhism but these were largely superficial.[29]

The council had isolated some major issues and challenges. Kern ended the article with these words, "All feelings of racial superiority must be purged from the heart, and we must really love them [adherents of other religions] and treat them as brothers."[30] At a time when many in the wider Christian church were contemplating whether or not other religions contained "truth,"

[24]Ibid.

[25]M. E. Kern, "How to Work for Hindus, Mohammedans, and Buddhists," *AR* 110.25 (22 June 1933): 9.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Ibid., 10.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Ibid., 11.

[30]Ibid.

Adventists in India were more interested in figuring out the best way to present the Gospel to these challenging groups.

Opening of the Advanced Bible School, 1934

In 1933 the General Conference Annual Council voted to open The Advanced Bible School in order to offer higher education to Adventist Bible teachers around the world.[31] This school was meant to help workers in the field increase their education beyond the bachelor level. It met for six weeks in the summer for a few years on the campus of Pacific Union College (PUC). By 1936 it had been voted to rename the school the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary and move it to Takoma Park near the General Conference headquarters.[32] The seminary would continue to grow and increase in enrollment over the next several years.

The opening of this school of higher learning is relevant to this study in a few different ways. First of all, the students who would come to the school in those early years represented nearly every region of the world Adventists had entered at this time. Many missionaries attended the school during their furlough, and many others studied there before going out into their assigned locations around the world. It was a mixing of the world church where ideas and concepts could be discussed and research could take place at a level the Adventist Church had not experienced up to this point.

In the academic bulletin for the first year, 1934, a course entitled "Studies in World Religions" is listed as a two-semester-credit course. It was taught by Benjamin P. Hoffman, then Dean of Theology at PUC. Hoffman had worked for a number of years in Japan before coming to PUC. The course description read:

> The origins, developments, and fundamental teachings of the leading world religions will be studied with reading from the "sacred" writings of these religions. "Acquaintance awakens sympathy and sympathy is the spring of effective ministry." There is no better way to become sympathetically acquainted with a people than to know something of their religious life. Some intelligent understanding of the real nature of the religious forces with which the missionary enterprise must constantly be in contact is also essential to all who bear responsibility for the progress of the cause of foreign missions, and especially in meeting the modern trends represented by recent appraisal commissions and fact-finding bodies, illustrated by "Re-Thinking Missions." Evidences that God has not left himself without some witness in any age or among any people, and His preparation among all peoples for the final worldwide proclamation of the gospel will be noted.[33]

[31]General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (Washington, DC), Minutes of Meetings of the General Conference Committee, 17–24 October 1933, meeting of 24 October 1933, 1123–1125.

[32]Idem, Minutes of Meetings of the Autumn Council, 21–28 October 1936, meeting of 27 October 1936, 167–168. This is the precursor to the current Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

[33]*Bulletin* (Angwin, CA: Andvanced Bible School, 1934), 14 (archived at the

The specific mention of the *Re-thinking Missions* book shows that at least some Adventists leaders were aware of the current debates in mission. Across the theological spectrum Adventists leaned heavily toward fundamentalist Christianity of the time period. This class description affirms this, but it also reveals Hoffman's belief that an understanding of other religions would help in fostering a more sympathetic attitude.

After 1935, however, the course on world religions was not offered until it reappeared in the 1938 bulletin. In the 1938 bulletin "non-Christian religions" is also listed in the "Purpose" statement of the fledgling Seminary. "Studies in World Religions" also reappears in the 1938 bulletin with Hoffman as the listed instructor again.[34] Oddly through the school year of 1940–1941 the purpose statement contained a reference to "non-Christian religions," but from 1939–1944 no specific course on world religions was listed.[35] One can only speculate as to why this was the case.[36]

While there were no specific courses from 1939–1944 in world religions, there were a number of "special lecture series" held for the students between 1935–1938 that dealt with world religions. In 1935 Oliver Montgomery presented a ten-part lecture on "Foreign Mission Problems," which in its description in the bulletin included working among "adherents of non-Christian religions."[37] In 1936 there were two special lecture series that dealt with other religions: "Presentation of Christ to Animists and Mohammedans" by J. G. Gjording, then president of the Malayan Union, and "Presentation of Christ to Non-Christians of China" by Frederick Lee, missionary to China.[38] Frederick Lee's lecture was, at least in part, published that same year in *Ministry*. He advocated a more careful approach to other religions that took the context of the other religions seriously.[39] In 1937 and 1938 the final two listed lecture series on world religions took place: "The World of Islam

Center for Adventist Research [CAR] housed in the James White Library on the campus of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan).

[34]The course description was shortened, and the lines on *Re-thinking Mission* were omitted. The general thought of the course description is basically the same, however. See *Bulletin* (Takoma Park MD: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1938–1939), 11, 19 (archived at CAR).

[35]To date I have not located any documentation as to why the course was offered and then removed and then offered again and then removed again.

[36]In the bulletin for the 1941–1942 school year the "Purpose" Statement is changed to the heading "Objectives," and there is no longer any reference to "non-Christian religions."

[37]*Bulletin* (Angwin, CA: Advanced Bible School, 1935), 20 (archived at CAR).

[38]Ibid., (1936), 20 (archived at CAR).

[39]Frederick Lee, "Reaching the Non-Christian with Our Message," *Ministry* 9.1 (1936): 14–15. In the article Lee stated several things that are of interest to this study: "We need not bring to the preaching of the gospel the taint of foreign environment" (ibid., 14). And later in the same article in a five-point list he also says, "Make points of contact through that which the native has experienced, and from this point seek to widen his vision" (ibid., 15).

Yesterday and Today" in three parts by Samuel Zwemer, one of the most well-known Protestant missionaries to Islam of the time; and "Hinduism" a six-part series by R. E. Loasby, who was involved in the Southern Asia Division council noted above.[40] The fact that a non-Adventist like Zwemer was invited is significant. At a time when Adventists were not known for their interdenominational cooperation, Zwemer was asked to give lectures on Islam at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. This may be an indication of the level of importance the seminary leadership saw in learning about Islam.[41]

Zwemer's lectures were later published in *Ministry*, divided up into five articles that ran periodically from the March 1938 issue to the February 1939 issue. Zwemer was clear on the need to understand Islam through thorough research and believed in careful understanding as being essential to reaching out to Muslims. Zwemer had published many articles and books on Islam based on his experiences living in the Middle East for many years. He was also adamant that Islam had little to offer Christianity and that "Islam is dead in Turkey, is dying in Persia, and has ceased to be a great force in India."[42] Zwemer was opposed to any type of fulfillment theology in relation to Islam and believed that it was not a "preparation" religion for the Gospel. He often wrote that it appeared the time was right for many to leave Islam and join Christianity, a prophecy that went largely unfulfilled during his lifetime.[43]

In the 1942–1943 school year several Arabic language courses were newly listed in the bulletin. The instructor was "an Iraqi brother, Khalil Ibrahim, known to Americans as [K]arl Bremson."[44] The bulletin does not give an explanation for the sudden appearance of these courses, but a voted action

[40]*Bulletin* (Takoma Park, MD: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1937), 23 (archived at CAR); ibid. (1938–1939), 28 (archived at CAR).

[41]Unfortunately I have not been able to locate any details concerning the contents of any of the lectures listed in this paragraph, with the exception of Samuel Zwemer's, which were later published in *Ministry*.

[42]This is taken from the issue of the *Watchman-Examiner* that was published on 16 September 1937, which was quoted in "The Religious Press," *Ministry*, 10.11 (1937): 21. Zwemer was a mentor to Hendrik Kraemer, whose book on non-Christian religions, published in 1938, became very influential.

[43]For the lectures that were published in *Ministry*, see "Islam as a World Problem," *Ministry* 11.3 (1938): 3–4, 41; "Challenge of Daybreak in Islam—No 1" *Ministry* 11.11 (1938): 5–6; "Daybreak in Islam—No. 2," *Ministry* 11.12 (1938): 17; "The Christology of Islam—No. 1," *Ministry* 12.1 (1939): 11–12; "Christology in Islam—No. 2," *Ministry* 12.2 (1939): 17–18, 46.

[44]W. E. Howell, "In Contact with Our Colleges," *AR* 119.46 (12 November 1942): 19. See also *Bulletin* (Takoma Park, MD: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1943–1944), 8, 24–25 (archived at CAR). Note in the General Conference committee minutes from 9 July 1942, there is record of the vote to bring "K. Bremson (Khalil Ibrahim)" to the Theological Seminary to teach Arabic (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Minutes of Meetings of the General Conference Committee, 2–30 July 1942, meeting of 9 July 1942, 507).

found in the General Conference Committee Minutes of 2–30 July 1942, does give some details. Under the sponsorship of R. E. Loasby, who had joined the faculty of the Seminary in 1938, a new initiative was undertaken to train Adventist missionaries specifically for working in the "Moslem" world. Bremson was hired as a result of this initiative. In connection with this new emphasis five families came to the Seminary and completed a number of Arabic courses before heading into mission work in the Middle East.[45]

In the "Foreword" to the bulletin for the 1943–1944 school year it was mentioned that a voted action was taken to include mission languages in the Seminary, as well as a separate "division" for "Missions and Christian Leadership." As seen above, the Arabic language courses had already been taught for a year, and now several other languages were added, although all of them were European languages, with the exception of Arabic. The most notable newly offered courses were "Islamics" and "Moslem Lands and Peoples," both taught by George Keough, a former missionary to Egypt.[46]

During the following school year of 1944–1945 the courses in Islam were again offered. In addition, a new course entitled "Christianity and Non-Christian Religions" taught by Andrew N. Nelson was also offered.[47] This course would continue to be offered throughout the decade, with the only change coming in 1947–1948, when D. E. Rebok took over as the instructor. The courses in Islam lasted until 1947–1948, when they no longer appear in the bulletin.

The increased interest in mission and world religions in the Seminary, especially Islam, during the 1940s was probably twofold. First, the appointment of D. E. Rebok in 1943 as the Seminary president certainly was a factor. Rebok had spent most of his active ministry life, prior to this appointment, involved in the educational work of the Adventist church in China. He came with a wealth of knowledge in missions and was also keenly interested in world religions. The second factor relates to World War II. As a result of the war many missionaries were either forced or chose to leave their mission stations to return to their homelands in Europe or North America. One of these was George Keough, who came to the U.S. from Egypt to teach.[48] The Seminary took advantage of his presence and used him for several years to teach courses in Arabic and Islam.

[45]See ibid., 507.

[46]The course description for "Islamics" was "A short review of the history of the rise of Islam; a study of the teachings of the Quran; the doctrine of the Trinity and the Sonship of Jesus." The course description for "Moslem Lands and Peoples" was "The geography and history of the Middle East, the customs of its people. Extensive reading required." See *Bulletin* (Takoma Park, MD: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1943–1944), 28 (archived at CAR). For the obituary of George Keough, see R. M. A. Smart, "Pastor George D. Keough," *British Advent Messenger* 76.19 (10 September 1971): 7.

[47]*Bulletin* (Takoma Park, MD: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1944–1945), 35–36 (archive at CAR).

[48]Pfeiffer, *European Seventh-day Adventist Mission*, 61.

In summary, it is important to recognize that during certain periods the Seminary was quite intentional about having courses in world religions. While this was never developed at the same level as the other areas of study (i.e. biblical studies, systematic theology, archaeology, and church history), it was important nonetheless. However, there were also periods when world religions were not a part of the curriculum, and in general until the arrival of D. E. Rebok they were relegated to the sidelines of academic study in the Seminary.

In comparison with the wider Christian movement it should be noted that many universities had begun including courses in Comparative Religion by this time. These were often meant to be objective studies of other religions and often viewed missionaries and missions as suspect. However, similar to the fundamentalist movement, Adventists viewed other religions as people groups to be evangelized, and therefore the seminary offered courses on world religions as part of the practical theology discipline, not as a separate comparative religions department.

The Middle Eastern "Committee of Three," 1935

In the 14 November 1935, issue of the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* there is a major article written by W. K. Ising, focused solely on the challenge of Islam. He prefaces the article with the admission that the Arabic Union Mission had done very poorly in engaging with Muslims, who made up the vast majority of the population in their territory. Ising was clear that it could only be through "the mind of God" that a workable method would be forthcoming.

The first step taken was to form a special committee "to draw up a plan for systematic study" of the major challenges posed by Islam. This committee consisted of Ising and two other European missionaries, Erich Bethmann, who was stationed in Transjordan, and Willy Lesovsky, who was stationed in Lebanon-Syria. A "circular letter was sent out" to the workers of the Union, asking for suggestions as to which methods were best.[49]

Heavy emphasis was laid on the necessity of studying Islam. This included the history of Islam, as well as Muslim religious thought. In order to help the readers achieve this goal, two separate headings were given with lists of important books that covered theological and historical topics in Islam and Arabia. Each book was described in brief to help the reader understand the content. At the end of the article there were six more headings with a more extensive bibliography of books that dealt with Islam and Arabian geography and culture. Thirty-six books were listed under the following headings: Arabia Before Mohammad; Mohammed; Expansion of Islam; The Koran; Islam Thought; and Ancient Oriental Churches and Islam. Many of the most recognized Islamic scholars of the day can be found on the list, including Samuel Zwemer, Sir William Muir, a highly respected expert in Islamic

[49]W. K. Ising, "Preparing for Work among Moslems," *AR* 112.46 (14 November 1935): 12.

history,[50] and F. A. Klein, a well-known writer in the area of comparative religions.[51]

The idea was that various workers throughout the Union would choose topics to study so that all the topics would be covered and studied carefully. They were then to report to Erich Bethmann which topic they were studying so as to avoid "undue overlapping" in topic choice. There were twenty topics to choose from under three headings, Arabia, Mohammad, and the Koran. Additions to the list were also allowed. It was then stipulated that the study should last no more than one year, at which time the "findings" were to be "summarized in a written thesis and sent to the secretary [Bethmann] for duplication and circulation."[52]

Around the same time it was noted "Elders Bethmann and Lesovsky" had "just completed the special summer course at the Newman School for Missions in Jerusalem. Elder Bethmann did special research work in their large library and advanced study of the Koran. Elder Lesovsky studied Arabic and Islamics."[53] The Newman School for Missions was primarily under the care of Eric F. F. Bishop and was started as a result of a major conference on the challenge of Islam held in Lucknow, India, in 1911, led by Samuel Zwemer. This was one of the few mission schools of its kind around the world at the time and would have been a unique and formative experience for Bethmann and Lesovsky, and no doubt played a role in their approach to Muslims.[54]

There were several key biblical passages that Ising drew on to motivate the readers in their preparation for working with Muslims. He highlighted the promise God made to Abraham concerning Ishmael as a sign of the potential in the Middle East. He also quoted Paul's words from 1 Corinthians 9:19–23 concerning becoming all things to all people. Isaiah 60:7 was also quoted as a promise that the sons of the East would come to God.[55]

In many ways this was the beginning of a very strong foundation for Adventist work among Muslims. The work with Muslims began to gain momentum at a greater pace than it did with other religions. The work done by these early pioneers was crucial, and in many ways they were not only

[50]Probably Sir William Muir's most well-known work was *The Caliphate: Its Rise, Decline and Fall* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1892).

[51]Ising, "Work among Muslims," 12, 13.

[52]Ibid., 13.

[52]Ibid.

[54]For more on the Newman School of Missions, see Lyle L. Vander Werff, *Christian Mission to Muslims: The Record: Anglican and Reformed Approaches in India and the Near East, 1800–1938* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1977), 231, 342. See also the following website: Adam Matthew Publications, "Church Missionary Society Archive: Section IX: Middle East Missions," http://www.ampltd.co.uk/digital_guides/cms_section_IX_part_1/Publishers-Note.aspx. Bishop was not a prolific writer, but he did author one significant work, which attempted to portray the gospels through a Palestinian cultural lens; see Eric F. F. Bishop, *Jesus of Palestine: The Local Backgrounds to the Gospel Documents* (London: Lutterworth, 1955).

[55]Ising, "Work Among Moslems," 12–13.

leading the Adventist Church but were also moving ahead of the work of the wider Christian movement among Muslims.[56]

Conclusion

While there were certainly many other important events in the development of Adventist approaches to other religions, these are some of the more prominent ones. At a time when the Christian world at large was embroiled in discussions on mission, especially as it related to other religions, Adventists were also engaging in discussion.

The increase in discussion among Adventists was manifested in two major councils, one in India the other in the Middle East. The Biennial council in Poona in 1933 highlighted the recognition that there were major challenges that had not been met in all three of the world's largest religions. The emphasis in the Middle East on a more careful approach to Islam in 1935 onward is also important because, as will be shown in part two, Adventist understandings and approaches to Islam became more developed than the Adventist approaches to either Hindus or Buddhists. The gathering of important leaders in both of these councils signaled to the wider Adventist Church that these were real issues that needed careful thinking and dialogue.

The opening of the Advanced Bible School, with its periodic offering of courses and special lectures in world religions, also reveals that the Adventist Church had interest in this important area, even if it was not the primary focus of the Seminary. Many of the leaders of the Adventist Church from around the world passed through classes at the young Seminary. Therefore, the fact that courses on other religions were periodically offered meant that the ideas these courses expounded potentially traveled around the world.

These three events highlight that other religions had started to appear much more frequently on the Adventist mission radar screen. The challenges people were facing in the mission field did not have easy solutions prompting larger discussions, councils, and even courses in the Seminary. While solutions remained elusive, many new ideas and prospects were formulated out of these events, creating the potential for new approaches to other religions.

The second part of this article will look more carefully at some of the key people who were leading the Adventist discussions on other religions between 1930 and 1950. It will also analyze some broad trends that the research has revealed regarding the overall Adventist approach to other religions during the same period. Together these two aspects will create a more complete picture of Adventist approaches to other religions from 1930 to 1950.

[56]For more on the build-up to this point in the Middle East, see Pfeiffer, *European Seventh-day Adventist Mission*.

DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

A STUDY ON THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS RELATING TO THE NOTION OF THE GOD-HUMAN RELATION UPON THE INTERPRETATION OF EXODUS

Name of researcher: Tiago Arrais
Name of adviser: Richard M. Davidson, Ph.D.
Date completed: July 2015

No exegesis or act of interpretation is presuppositionless. Accordingly, this study addresses the question of the influence of philosophical presuppositions upon the interpretation of the God-human relation in Exodus. Chapter one provides a brief introduction to why such analysis is necessary. It explores the neglected issue of presuppositions in exegesis and why Exodus is an appropriate platform upon which to evaluate them. This introductory chapter also presents the purpose and methodological approach of this study, namely, the descriptive analysis of the text. Chapter two addresses the philosophical issues behind the conception of the God-human relation, namely, the notion of ontology (God), the notion of epistemology (human), and the notion of history (relationship). Chapter three identifies these philosophical conceptions in the foundation of two interpretative traditions: the historical-grammatical and historical-critical methods. Chapter four traces the influence of these presuppositions within the interpretation of Exodus in general and in the context of the notion of the God-human relation in particular. The dissertation concludes by summarizing its findings and conclusions and exploring the academic and existential implications of the study.

IDENTITY STYLES, MEDIATED BY COMMITMENT AND SYNCRETISM, AS PREDICTORS OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SELECTED DISCIPLESHIP PRACTICES AT VALLEY VIEW UNIVERSITY IN GHANA IN 2015: IMPLICATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Name of researcher: Juvénal Balisasa
Name of adviser: John V. G. Matthews, Ph.D.
Date completed: May 2016

Problem

The study of student life on campus has attracted numerous social-science enquiries, especially in the areas of spirituality, religiosity, and meaning-making in life. Of particular interest has been the attempt to restore value-based education in Christian institutions of higher learning, taking cognizance of the need for cultural contextualization and the influence of postmodern ideology. This present study sought to examine the possible predictive role of identity styles, mediated by commitment and syncretism, in the attitudes toward discipleship practices among undergraduate students of Valley View University in Ghana, West Africa in 2015.

Method

The study employed the principles of a quantitative, non-experimental, cross-sectional survey. Non-random convenient sampling method was used to collect data. Eight hundred students were sampled from the second- to the fourth-year groups. The study used path analysis as the main technique to examine the data.

Results

All the endogenous variables were significantly predicted (Commitment [R^2= .400], Syncretism [R^2= .278], Satisfaction [R^2= .020], and Involvement [R^2= .482]) in their respective hierarchical path models. However, the overall hypothesized model did not fit the data. The total effects of the exogenous variables (i.e., informational identity style, normative identity style, and diffuse-avoidant identity style) on satisfaction (.118; .009; and .028, respectively) and on involvement (.082; .006; and .019, respectively) were weak. However, there were significant relationships between some variables, which have important implications for discipleship and religious education in higher education.

Conclusion

The results of the study show that students' self-reported identity styles did not significantly predict their satisfaction and involvement in discipleship

practices at Valley View University. These results are in line with the biblical perspective of discipleship, in that Christian discipleship does not primarily depend on who the prospective disciples are at the point of their calling, but on the way in which they are led to encounter Jesus Christ.

UNION WITH CHRIST IN THE WRITINGS OF ELLEN G. WHITE

Name of researcher: Katrina B. Blue
Name of adviser: Denis Fortin, Ph.D.
Date completed: October 2015

Building on the work of the nineteenth-century theologian, Augustus Strong, five historical approaches to union with Christ identified by Bruce Demarest in the late twentieth century include: an ontological union, a sacramental union, a covenantal union, a moral or filial union, and an experiential union. Given the identification of multiple approaches to union with Christ, my dissertation attempts to clarify Ellen G. White's concept of union with Christ, using Demarest's categories as an evaluation tool. I traced the development of her writings on union with Christ from 1860 to 1898, to ask whether White's approach is best described as an ontological, sacramental, covenantal, moral or filial, or experiential union. While elements of some of the approaches Demarest identified are evident in White's writings, such as the need for believers to experience Christ for themselves, no one category fits White's approach exclusively.

A THEOLOGY OF MISSIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Name of researcher: Gyeongchun Choi
Name of adviser: Stanley E. Patterson, Ph.D.
Date completed: March 2016

Problem

Leadership styles and the attendant behavior of mission practitioners and church administrators too often demonstrate leadership attitudes and practices that reflect cultural norms while violating biblical norms. There is both historical and contemporary evidence of a predictable migration from leadership as service to leadership as control—such as autocracy, coercion, self-ascendancy, and dominance. These problems are found in leadership practices primarily informed by cultural norms apart from God's Word. These norms vary widely and may even be practiced within the faith community, thus violating biblical principles. This reality creates an urgent need for the application of biblical principles that transcend cultures and bring leadership practices into alignment with the character and behavior of the Trinity.

Method

Since this study aims to establish a theology of missional leadership through the motif of the Great Controversy and seeks to discover leadership principles from the book of Revelation, I examine the book of Revelation and compare it with relevant leadership theories. I also look at Revelation in order to arrive at a theology of missional leadership by looking at terminology and context linked to leadership. As appropriate, I examine the concerns of systematic theology—for example, free-will, eschatology, and pneumatology—to support the theological analysis.

Results

The book of Revelation is a valid source of understanding pastoral and missional leadership. Revelation contains leadership terminologies and concepts by revealing the Lamb's leadership behavior and exposing the counterfeit leadership of the Dragon. Amid the crossfire of the Great Controversy between God and Satan, the Lamb leads his people by an exemplary model of leadership in which he manifests the fundamentals of Christian leadership principles. Three dimensions of the Great Controversy worldview—cognitive, affective, and evaluative—delineate the antithetical leadership practices between the Lamb and the Dragon regarding power and authority, equality and unity, motivation of followers, humility in the sacrifice of leaders, spiritual transformation, and emotional values. Also, the song of the Lamb in Revelation details characteristics of the Lamb's leadership: unity in humility, motivation and a willing heart, transparency and trust, egalitarian relationships, and the similitude of the divine character.

Conclusions

The Great Controversy between God and Satan highlights the roles of the Lamb and the Dragon in leading the events of human history. The numerous topics of Revelation are expanded around these two antithetical characters. The purpose of this contrast is to give clear information about the reality of the Great Controversy, so that people cannot be deceived by the Dragon's counterfeit reign and, instead, give their allegiance to God before the final judgment.

The Lamb contrasts the Dragon's leadership behavior in paradoxical ways. While the Dragon shows coercive authoritarian leadership, the Lamb presents his power in powerlessness and activeness in passivity. While the Dragon promotes self-ascension, the Lamb humbly steps down from the top to serve his people. Nevertheless, his position is not threatened as a result. While the Dragon leads people with a devouring mouth (cf. Rev 12:4; 13:2), the Lamb leads without utterance. Although his way seems to be weak and less effective, his ministry is strong and eternal.

Consequently, the Lamb's leadership is not similar to secular leadership which pursues productivity and efficiency as its main goal. In contrast with the industrial model of leadership, the Lamb's leadership manifests a relational leadership model which transcends pragmatic thinking on leadership. The Lamb's leadership demonstrates Christian leadership as (1) spiritual, (2) theological, (3) moral, (4) eschatological, (5) ecclesiological, (6) relational, and (7) missional.

AN ANALYSIS OF ADVENTIST MISSION METHODS IN BRAZIL IN RELATIONSHIP TO A CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT ETHOS

Name of researcher: Marcelo E. C. Dias
Name of adviser: Bruce Bauer, D.Miss.
Date completed: May 2016

In a little over 100 years, the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Brazil has grown to a membership of 1,447,470 (December 2013), becoming the country with the second-highest total number of Adventists in the world. Very little academic research has been done to study or analyze the growth and development of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Brazil. In terms of its mission methods, what is the Christian movement ethos that fostered this development in Brazil? How can it continue to foster the growth of the Adventist Church in Brazil in spite of contextual changes?

As a missiological study that reflects typical interdisciplinarity crossing traditional boundaries of academic disciplines to borrow methods and insights and apply them toward a better understanding of a specific problem, this study employs Gailyn van Rheenen's Missional Helix and intertwines theological reflection, cultural analysis, historical perspective, and strategy formation within the context of the practice of ministry. The first part of this research is a biblico-historical overview of the character of Christian movements followed by a socio-religious systematization of the ethos of Christian movements. The third part focuses on the ethos of the Adventist movement in Brazil, including a description and analysis of its mission methods. The present study analyzes five major mission methods used by the Adventist Church in Brazil from 1895 to 2007, based on the characteristics of an Adventist missionary movement ethos, in order to draw lessons to face the contemporary contextual challenges.

A brief analysis of the Adventist movement in Brazil, according to the proposed ethos model (confession of Jesus as Savior, Lord, and Priest; a missional-incarnational impulse of the soon coming of Jesus; an apostolic movement as part of the Great Controversy; *communitas* as a reflection of the will of God for relationships as described in God's commandments; organic systems according to spiritual gifts; and disciple-making in preparation for eternity), suggests specific findings. Clearly, the Adventist Church has grown and developed as it has relied on different mission methods (literature evangelism, public evangelism, radio and TV evangelism, metropolitan evangelism, and integrated evangelism). And, even after discounting some of the obviously triumphalist enthusiasm found in the church leaders' reports and official sources of information, one is able to identify signs of a movement motivated by its mission.

In many ways, the overall lesson of this analysis is the importance of fostering mission as a way of living that is at the core of an Adventist movement and developing methods based on a biblical understanding of Christianity that will develop movements with a missionary ethos. In spite of the somewhat positive analysis of the Adventist movement ethos in Brazil, it is

clear that there is much room for improvement in each area. This is especially important in face of the realization of the ideal biblical standards and the current contextual changes. A sign that the Adventist movement in Brazil has developed a true Christian ethos and a mature missiological understanding would be its significant missionary-sending activity to the world.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH AND CHURCH AUTHORITY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE VIEWS AND PRACTICE OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AND ELLEN G. WHITE

Name of researcher: Wendy A. Jackson
Name of adviser: Denis Fortin, Ph.D.
Date completed: March 2015

Problem

A clear understanding of the nature of church unity and the role of authority in the maintenance of unity is imperative for the church in the face of its increasing growth and diversity. While a considerable volume of literature addresses the topic of unity of the church, little attention has been paid to the historical dimensions of the differing viewpoints on church authority, which present contemporary obstacles to Christian unity.

Purpose

In an attempt to address this void, this dissertation examines the views of Alexander Campbell and Ellen White with regard to the nature of church unity and how this is to be attained, with a specific focus on the nature and role of church authority in the accomplishment of that goal.

Methodology and Sources

The approach of this study is to survey the published primary sources of both leaders in an attempt to establish their understanding of the nature of unity and how it is to be attained. It does so in the context of their hermeneutics, ecclesiology, and views on the authority structure of the church. The theory of each individual is then supplemented with case studies which examine how these principles function in their own practice of ministry. A mixture of published and unpublished material is utilized to maximize the value of the case studies. The descriptive data is then used to perform a comparative evaluation of the two views.

Conclusions

The study finds that that both Campbell and White have Christ-centered models of unity, which emphasize that unity cannot occur without authentic Christianity. However, differing concepts of the underlying causes of disunity, along with differing views of what Christian unity looks like, result in two very different models for maintaining unity. The models are further impacted by the hermeneutics, ecclesiology, and eschatological viewpoints of Campbell and White. Campbell's approach to unity as part of a comprehensive restoration of primitive Christianity effectively limited the possible authority structures of the church. Campbell nevertheless used creative approaches to

circumvent this problem. Ellen White's views, on the other hand, are not dependent upon any one particular form of authority structure. Instead they emphasize the importance of order and the character of the leaders within the authority structure.

THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF CONVERSION IN THE BROADER CONTEXT OF EXPERIENCE OF FAITH FORMATION: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY OF THIRD- AND GREATER-GENERATION SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST YOUNG ADULTS

Name of researcher: Edyta Jankiewicz
Name of adviser: Tevni Grajales, Ph.D.
Date completed: March 2016

Problem

While the New Testament Scriptures describe the characteristics of first-generation conversion, they do not describe how the children of believers come to Christian faith. Moreover, while there has been considerable empirical research on conversion, very little of it addresses conversion in the lives of those nurtured in faith. As a result, many second- and greater-generation Christians may feel that the term "conversion" does not describe their spiritual experiences. The purpose of this study was to describe the lived experience of conversion in the lives of those nurtured in faith from childhood.

Method

This study adopted a phenomenological approach to qualitative research. The sample for this study included Seventh-day Adventist young adults who had grown up within an Seventh-day Adventist family and faith context, who were at least third-generation Seventh-day Adventist, and who were currently members of Seventh-day Adventist faith communities. Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with fourteen participants, who were asked to describe both their formational faith experiences as well as their conversion experiences. A hermeneutical approach to analysis was then implemented; this involved weaving codes and categories together with ideas generated through analytic memo-writing, and then organizing them into recurring themes.

Results

Across the 14 interviews, the experiences of both faith formation and conversion were identified. From the pattern of overlapping themes that emerged from data analysis, the experience of faith formation can be described as a dynamic process that integrates the intellectual, affective, and behavioral domains of life, is facilitated by community, and necessitates personal choice. Within this broader context of experience of faith formation, the participants in this study experienced conversion, which they described as a gradual, ongoing process, facilitated by multiple significant moments or events that occurred across the course of their lives. This process involved movement toward integration of childhood, adolescent, and young-adult experiences in both the intellectual and affective domains, and was accompanied by behavioral

choices that resulted in greater congruence between the intellectual, affective, and behavioral domains of faith.

Conclusion

The findings of this study suggest that third- and greater-generation believers experience conversion as a gradual process of change in the intellectual, affective, and behavioral domains that in many ways parallels the experiences of first-generation believers; however, while for first-generation Christians these are new experiences, those who have grown up within the context of faith experience conversion as an integration of formational and later experiences, frequently resulting in a less dramatic experience. These findings provide second- and greater-generation believers with a framework for understanding their spiritual experiences, as well as with a language for articulating a conversion narrative, both of which may facilitate a more authentic faith.

THE BACKGROUNDS AND MEANING OF THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST IN REV 13:14, 15

Name of researcher: Rebekah Yi Liu
Name of adviser: Jon Paulien, Ph.D.
Date completed: December 2015

Problem

This dissertation investigates the first-century Greco-Roman cultural backgrounds and the literary context of the motif of the image of the beast in Rev 13:14–15, in order to answer the problem of the author's intended meaning of the image of the beast to his first-century Greco-Roman readers.

Method

There are six steps necessary to accomplish the task of this dissertation. These steps are taken in the form of exegetical studies, which are done in six chapters, respectively.

Following the introductory chapter, the second chapter is a brief history of the historical interpretations of the image of the beast in Rev 13:14–15, starting with the interpretations from scholars of the first three centuries and continuing on to the present. This historical survey in chapter two demonstrates that an in-depth exegetical study of the image of the beast is much needed. Chapters three to six are an attempt to make up for this deficiency by providing an exegetical study of the image of the beast motif in its original cultural and literary context of the book of Revelation.

Chapter three is a study of the image-of-the-beast motif within its immediate context of Rev 13. Chapters four to six are a study of the image-of-the-beast motif in the latter half of Revelation, i.e., Rev 14–20, with chapters four to five studying the image-of-the-beast motif in the chapters in which this term occurs (Rev 14–16, 19–20), and chapter six studying this motif in the chapters which this term is absent (Rev 17–18).

Conclusion

Rev 13:14–15 depicts the unholy Trinity's attempt to counteract God's goal for the plan of salvation, i.e., the restoration of Imago Dei in human beings in the last days, by creating the image of the beast on the earth. The image of the beast is an end-time institution, comprised of a community of people who reflect the character of the dragon, and has the three-fold religious-economic-political power to impose false worship on the earth. This institution is best identified with the end-time Babylon the Great of Rev 17–18.

THE AFTERLIFE VIEWS AND THE USE OF THE TANAKH IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESURRECTION CONCEPT IN THE LITERATURE OF SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD: THE APOCRYPHA AND THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Name of researcher: Jan Åge Sigvartsen
Name of adviser: Jaques B. Doukhan, D.H.L., Th.D.
Date completed: May 2016

The literature of Second Temple Period Judaism indicates there was an increased interest in and speculation about the fate of the righteous and the wicked following their physical death. This period saw the birth of multiple Jewish sects and also multiple views of the afterlife. This study will outline the numerous afterlife views and will analyze the resurrection passages appearing in the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha to gain a comprehensive overview of the texts used from the *Tanakh* in support of these various resurrection beliefs. This study also provides a better understanding of how the *Tanakh* was read by differing communities during this important period and the role the *Tanakh* played in the development of the resurrection belief—a central article of faith in both Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism.

Appendix A of this study provides a comprehensive list of resurrection passages from Second Temple Period literature, compiled from the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha, which are categorized and analyzed. Anthologies of the listed passages are also provided to show the larger context of each resurrection statement. Appendix B lists resurrection passages also found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, New Testament, and Early Rabbinic material.

In addition to outlining the numerous afterlife views, this study provides comprehensive examinations of the resurrection passages that either refer or allude to texts from the *Tanakh* in support of a resurrection belief. This gives a better understanding of the role the *Tanakh* played in the development of the resurrection belief and reveals which *Tanakh* passages were considered resurrection passages by authors and/or communities who produced these Second Temple Period compositions. Primary findings, their implications, and some general observations are also discussed.

This study identifies eighteen distinct views regarding "life-after-death," with varying degrees of complexity, suggesting great diversity in resurrection beliefs during this period. There is also no progress from a basic to a more complex death-and-resurrection view, as differing levels of complexity are represented throughout the period. Thus, there is no linear development of the resurrection belief, but rather, multiple views coexisted, although an eschatological bodily resurrection belief became the central tenet for both Rabbinic Judaism and the Early Christian Church. There seems to be no evidence in this literature in support of a shift in focus from a bodily resurrection toward the immortality of the soul, as the fate of both the body and soul seem to be of great interest to the authors and the communities to which they belonged. Several influencing factors are identified as causing the

many resurrection perspectives, such as human anthropology, the nature of the soul, scope of the resurrection, number and function of the Judgments, and the final destination of the righteous and the wicked.

A careful reading of these resurrection passages in the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha reveals that most of the distinct views on "life-after-death," regardless of their complexity, are often supported by several key passages from the *Tanakh* or shared motifs with the *Tanakh*. It is suggested that future analysis of these key passages from the *Tanakh* may shed further light on how literary works from this period interpreted, understood, used, and reused the *Tanakh*. It may even determine if the resurrection belief is indeed present in these texts (based on exegesis) or if this belief was read into these texts by Second Temple Period authors (an example of eisegesis). Based on preliminary observations, some of these resurrection concepts seem to derive naturally from the *Tanakh*, while others seem to be based on an interpretation or a more elaborate exegesis. Yet, other usages seem a bit more forced, and in those cases the *Tanakh* appears to be considered a source of proof-texts, seemingly often disregarding the larger context of the text quoted or alluded to. Early Second Temple Period resurrection texts seem to be supported by a creative use of the *Tanakh*, while late Second Temple Period, Early Christian, and Rabbinic texts seem to utilize more proof-texting—some of which were used by several literary works in support of their unique perspective on the afterlife.

An awareness of Second Temple Period literature is helpful for gaining a better understanding of the death and afterlife views presented in the New Testament and in Early Rabbinic literature, as it shows they are a part of the larger discussion taking place during this critical period. Table 45 provides a list of the *Tanakh* passages which were either referred or alluded to in the context of the resurrection statements surveyed from the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha. Table 46 centers on the eighteen distinct afterlife views and indicates which views are supported by the *Tanakh*. These two tables give an indication of the number of *Tanakh* texts which were perceived as resurrection texts and the texts which were most often referred or alluded to.

THE HISTORICAL SUPERSCRIPTIONS OF DAVIDIC PSALMS: AN EXEGETICAL, INTERTEXTUAL, AND METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Name of researcher: Jerome L. Skinner
Name of adviser: Jiří Moskala, Ph.D.
Date completed: April 2016

The significance of the historical superscriptions that refer to David's life (Pss 3, 7, 18, 34, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 142) has been a matter of interest over the past century of psalm studies. While the historicity forms a large part of the discussion, at its core is the issue of meaning. The literary and theological aspects of the historical superscriptions and their psalms provide the clearest basis for discussions of meaning. The literary milieu of the Psalter provides a context in which comparisons can be made. Contrary to more recent suggestions, the historiographical interests of these psalms go well beyond an apology for David.

This dissertation engages the topic of the historical superscriptions in three ways: exegetically, intertextually, and methodologically. This study first analyzes the psalms individually to provide the foundational groundwork for a collective view of authorial indications and subsequent analysis. This is examined through the central themes that emerge from three interrelated features of poetic analysis: (1) structure, (2) imagery, and (3) parallelism. The recent gains in analysis of Hebrew poetry in the Hebrew Bible have enabled readers to see new foci, such as literary features and epistemic aspects that emerge from the text as part of the exegetical process.

This is followed by an analysis of the stylistic and intertextual aspects of the historical superscriptions found in the thirteen historical superscriptions. After determining the intertextual perspectives that emerge from the historical superscriptions, a consideration of how to understand the intertextual links within a larger structural view is examined. These intertextual links are determined by analyzing linguistic connections in light of the structural concerns of the books of 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Chronicles. This analysis is prompted by the stylistic and linguistic features of the historical superscriptions. The patterns that emerge lead to a comparison of lexical and thematic parallels between adjacent psalms that form a widening focus on psalm groups and the historical books to the HB.

Following this is an examination of the structural uses of ל and how the features of the historical superscriptions point to Davidic authorship. The syntactical constructions of the historical superscriptions are surveyed to demonstrate the veracity and originality of Davidic authorship. Also, generic and structural analyses are made to substantiate these claims. The final chapter provides a methodological critique of views on the historical superscriptions and sets forth more fortuitous paths in developing a coherent method that is more comprehensive.

In conclusion, some, if not all, of the historical superscriptions appear to be written by David and in some instances brought into groups with David's oversight. A canonical approach to the topic is shown to be the best view that incorporates all perspectives and fills in details that otherwise would remain unknown. The theological context of the Davidic Covenant provides the basis for understanding how the historical superscriptions are appropriated in subsequent literature. The life of David is paradigmatic as a theological model. The ultimate meaning of the historical superscriptions is represented through the development of Yahweh's plan for his covenant people and promises.

BOOK REVIEWS

Boxall, Ian. *Discovering Matthew: Content, Interpretation, Reception*. DBT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015. ix + 206 pp. Softcover, US$22.00.

Ian Boxall is associate professor of New Testament at The Catholic University of America. He previously taught New Testament at Chichester Theological College and the University of Oxford. He has published a number of books, including *The Revelation of St John* (Black's New Testament Commentaries) and *Patmos in the Reception History of the Apocalypse* (Oxford University Press).

Discovering Matthew has twelve substantial chapters followed by a short concluding chapter. As such, it would make an appropriate undergraduate textbook. Chapter 1 contains a historical survey of the status of the Gospel and the shift in critical scholarship from Matthean to Markan priority. This is followed by a description of what Boxall deems to be a number of "contradictory elements" within the Gospel (e.g., universalism vs. particularism, "Jewish" and "anti-Jewish" statements, mercy vs. judgment). These tensions are left unresolved, thus setting the agenda for the rest of the book. The chapter concludes with an overview of the Gospel's plot.

The second chapter presents various critical approaches used to interpret Matthew. Boxall argues that the quest for univocal meaning characteristic of both historical criticism, with its emphasis on authorial intention and original context, and narrative criticism, with its focus on the meaning of the text, contrasts with both precritical and postmodern approaches. Precritical patristic exegesis recognized multiple levels of meaning in the text, whether literal, spiritual, or allegorical. Boxall suggests that this approach rings true with postmodern expectations that texts embody a plethora of meanings.

In chapter three, Boxall discusses background questions, such as authorship, dating, structure, textual variants, and auditory experience. He follows the majority of critical Matthean scholarship in accepting Markan priority and rejecting the apostle Matthew as author. He accepts a post-70-CE dating based upon the widely held belief that Matt 22:7 alludes to the burning of Jerusalem. In chapter 4, Boxall uses narrative criticism to analyze Matthew's characters and settings.

The fifth chapter focuses on the historical and social location of the Gospel. Boxall presents evidence that the early Church Fathers read Matthew with the conviction that the evangelist wrote for a Jewish audience. For Boxall, this picture is nuanced by the fact that Matthew both affirms and criticizes traditional Jewish beliefs and practices. Boxall favors an *intra muros* Christian Jewish Matthean community as the intended readership. Precise identification of the Gospel's geographical setting adds little, however, to the interpretation of the Gospel. Instead, Boxall suggests that it is more important to "posit an appropriate imaginative setting" (74). He suggests first-century Capernaum as a fruitful location in which to imagine the reception of the Gospel.

Boxall turns to the "infancy narratives" in chapter 6. He presents and assesses the differences between Matt 1–2 and Luke 1–2 and concludes that

Matthew's technique is that of "creative historiography" (77). He suggests that this section of the Gospel serves the christological function of introducing Jesus and the apologetic function of addressing possible Jewish objections to the nature of his birth and origins.

Chapter seven covers Jesus as teacher. Boxall discusses various discourses in the Gospel and accepts the suggestion of Ulrich Luz that those discourses directed toward the disciples are transparent in nature. They were addressed not just to "the original audiences of the evangelist's own time, but to the Church throughout history" (94). Boxall then focuses on the contents and reception history of the Sermon on the Mount and the parables of Matt 13. He ends with a discussion of prominent themes in Jesus' teachings, namely, judgment, apocalyptic revelation, and the Son of Man. He also defends the evangelist against those modern readers who critique him for holding a "fire and brimstone" theology.

In the eighth chapter, Jesus is presented as healer and exorcist. Boxall categorizes Matthew's miracles according to type and defends them as reflections of the earliest Christian traditions. Matthew presents Mark's miracles in a strikingly concise manner, thus enabling them to function as transparent examples, giving "Christian readers in the present confidence that they can approach the risen Lord for their own needs" (111). As well as being transparent, Matthew's miracle stories are "sympathetic" to "a more symbolic interpretation," a well-known example being Günther Bornkamm's reading of the boat in the storm as transparent to the Church in the post-Easter period.

In chapter nine Boxall discusses the evangelist's use of and relationship to the Law and the Prophets. Matthew's citations of the Old Testament are deemed to reflect his own creativity, reliance on his memory, and use of a variety of Old Testament textual traditions. The Matthean Jesus affirms the Law, whether it be in relation to Sabbath observance, dietary laws, or grounds for divorce.

Boxall considers the role of Peter and the relationship between Matthew's community and formative Judaism in chapter 10. He argues against supersessionism and reads the reference in Matt 21:43 "to a people (ἔθνει)" producing the fruits of the kingdom as denoting not the Gentiles, but a "company" or "group of people" (137). The move is not from Jews to Gentiles, but rather a change in Israel's leadership from the Jerusalem elite to the followers of Jesus.

Chapter 11 covers the death of Jesus. Boxall does not prioritize one explanation of Jesus' death. Instead, he suggests that Jesus' death simultaneously represents the righteous sufferer of the Psalms, the silent servant of Isaiah, the obedient Son of God, and Zechariah's stricken shepherd. In addition, the death of Jesus is presented as the shedding of innocent blood. The natural phenomena surrounding the death of Jesus mark it out as the dawn of the new age.

In the twelfth chapter, Boxall compares Matthew's resurrection account with Jewish resurrection expectations and the other canonical Gospels. He concludes with an exploration of possible Old Testament motifs in the

Gospel Commission. The thirteenth and concluding chapter offers a number of reflections on the nature of the Gospel.

I now move to an assessment of Boxall's work. In general, this is a highly informative and detailed introduction to Matthew. It is well researched and demonstrates a deep awareness of the Gospel, relevant critical approaches, and reception history. On most critical issues, he reflects the consensus position held by Matthean scholarship. I would offer three main critiques.

First, the order and organization of material in the first five chapters is not always apparent. This is not to argue that there is no order. It is simply to make the point that particular effort is required of the reader in the case of a number of these chapters to work out their respective purposes. A clear statement of purpose in the respective opening paragraphs or pages would have considerably helped. In contrast, the second half of the book (chapters six to twelve) is easier to follow in that the contents reflects the order of the Gospel.

Secondly, as an introductory text, it would be easy to critique *Discovering Matthew* for omission or superficiality. Such criticism is a cheap shot at a book that does not set out to provide a comprehensive treatment of the Gospel. Nevertheless, it is important to be clear as to what is included and what is left out. The main strength of this book is that it covers reception history in a degree of detail not typically found in introductions to the Gospel. This is helpful and allows the reader to situate his or her own interpretation within a wider context. This benefit, however, comes at a cost. The downside is that less treatment is given to the Gospel itself. Boxall typically applies four approaches to the Gospel: first, he describes and analyses a portion of the Gospel; second, he compares Matthew's account with those of his contemporary evangelists, with emphasis on identifying redactional nuances unique to the first Gospel; third, he provides historical examples of the impact the Gospel has made, and fourth, he discusses critical approaches to the text. The result is an almost overwhelming degree of information and detail. The impact on this particular reader was the sense that the Gospel, while of unquestionable importance for Boxall, nevertheless serves as a springboard to discussions of issues of secondary importance for discovering Matthew's intention. It is very easy to lose sight of the evangelist and his message amidst the throng of his fellow evangelists, later interpreters, and contemporary scholars.

Third, Boxall's hermeneutical approach tends to downplay the role of authorial intention and the Gospel as a *bios* about Jesus. He reads the Gospel as "capable of meaning several things" beyond the intention of the author (175). This partly results from the "range of possible intertextual allusions" to different portions of the Old Testament (176). In addition, he reads the Gospel as a reflection of the Matthean community's situation. The Gospel simultaneously reflects the time of Jesus and the time of composition. In practice, however, the result of this approach is a focus on Matthew's redactional emphasis and those Gospel characters deemed to reflect the Matthean community and formative Judaism. A corrective to this approach would be a stronger emphasis on the relationship between the Gospel and the historical Jesus. I would also have preferred more on the Gospel's theology, Christology,

and soteriology. We are provided with just under one page on God as a character in the Gospel (47–48). This compares with fairly lengthy examples throughout the book of the impact the Gospel has made in art and music.

In conclusion, this is a well-written introduction to Matthew. It is ambitious in its scope. It may be a little overly ambitious for those readers whose primary objective is to discover the mind and message of Matthew.

Andrews University Cedric Vine

Chin, Catherine M., and Moulie Vidas, eds. *Late Ancient Knowing: Explorations in Intellectual History*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2014. 297 pp. Hardcover, US$95.00.

While learning modern Hebrew in Jerusalem, I had a teacher who used to say to her students, "If you don't know, you don't ask." Although she was referring to our ignorance, as foreigners, of the complexity of the Hebrew language, her dictum portrays well how humans grow in their intellectual journey. It is probable that if we do not know our history and the strange world of the past (the ancient other), we might not know ourselves properly. *Late Ancient Knowing* is a good collection of essays that will enhance the reader's perception of this important but mostly neglected past.

Very few, if any, in Late Antiquity questioned autocracy, slavery, or other social institutions. They just assumed them as an integral part of their reality. Were these assumed by Paul and the first Christians? If yes, why? Surely, no one should dismiss the impact of ancient knowing upon the formation of Christianity. The existence of supernatural beings and their action affecting human lives were also unquestioned. Ideas such as these shaped ancient worldview(s), their way of knowing things. Humans, however, are not static, and therefore new knowledge was discovered because of curiosity and because new questions were asked concerning old readings of reality. Societies in the centuries following the life of Jesus underwent not only a religious transformation but an epistemological one that influenced present worldviews. The Christianization of great parts of the Roman and Persian empires opened new ways for their members to see the world. But Christianity was not the only intellectual force shaping ancient epistemology.

Late Ancient Knowing gathers articles with different perspectives, addressing different themes through different kinds of focus. It brings a collection of essays from Jewish, Christian, and Pagan perspectives on thirteen themes: artifact, animal, language, medicine, cosmos, angel, god, emperor, ordo (order), Christianization, cleric, countryside, and demon. These themes will help the reader to see/understand ancient epistemology and shed some light on this fascinating period of human civilization, unfortunately unknown to most of us.

The introduction and afterword summarize major points of the book. Ancient people saw their world as a complex organism, leading them to use different epistemological approaches to try to systematize their knowledge of it. Late Ancient knowing was the "habit of systematization built on

and soteriology. We are provided with just under one page on God as a character in the Gospel (47–48). This compares with fairly lengthy examples throughout the book of the impact the Gospel has made in art and music.

In conclusion, this is a well-written introduction to Matthew. It is ambitious in its scope. It may be a little overly ambitious for those readers whose primary objective is to discover the mind and message of Matthew.

Andrews University Cedric Vine

Chin, Catherine M., and Moulie Vidas, eds. *Late Ancient Knowing: Explorations in Intellectual History*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2014. 297 pp. Hardcover, US$95.00.

While learning modern Hebrew in Jerusalem, I had a teacher who used to say to her students, "If you don't know, you don't ask." Although she was referring to our ignorance, as foreigners, of the complexity of the Hebrew language, her dictum portrays well how humans grow in their intellectual journey. It is probable that if we do not know our history and the strange world of the past (the ancient other), we might not know ourselves properly. *Late Ancient Knowing* is a good collection of essays that will enhance the reader's perception of this important but mostly neglected past.

Very few, if any, in Late Antiquity questioned autocracy, slavery, or other social institutions. They just assumed them as an integral part of their reality. Were these assumed by Paul and the first Christians? If yes, why? Surely, no one should dismiss the impact of ancient knowing upon the formation of Christianity. The existence of supernatural beings and their action affecting human lives were also unquestioned. Ideas such as these shaped ancient worldview(s), their way of knowing things. Humans, however, are not static, and therefore new knowledge was discovered because of curiosity and because new questions were asked concerning old readings of reality. Societies in the centuries following the life of Jesus underwent not only a religious transformation but an epistemological one that influenced present worldviews. The Christianization of great parts of the Roman and Persian empires opened new ways for their members to see the world. But Christianity was not the only intellectual force shaping ancient epistemology.

Late Ancient Knowing gathers articles with different perspectives, addressing different themes through different kinds of focus. It brings a collection of essays from Jewish, Christian, and Pagan perspectives on thirteen themes: artifact, animal, language, medicine, cosmos, angel, god, emperor, ordo (order), Christianization, cleric, countryside, and demon. These themes will help the reader to see/understand ancient epistemology and shed some light on this fascinating period of human civilization, unfortunately unknown to most of us.

The introduction and afterword summarize major points of the book. Ancient people saw their world as a complex organism, leading them to use different epistemological approaches to try to systematize their knowledge of it. Late Ancient knowing was the "habit of systematization built on

epistemological heterogeneit" (11). There was a tension between the one and the infinity, and tension of the approachable and similar over against the foreign and distant. This tension is evident in the articles about *Cosmos*, *Emperor*, and *Ordo*. But looking carefully, all essays demonstrate that, whereas there was an acknowledgment of the nature of reality as a complex thing and the existence of multiple ways to approach reality in antiquity, intellectuals also had a cultural impulse to bring order to the heterogeneous nature of reality. This epistemological approach led many ancient writers, discussed in the essays, to adapt their epistemological systems to new realities, some more than others. Another major point I perceived is how the understanding of the "other" was a reflection of how humans saw themselves. For example, the ancient discussion about animals and artifacts was also about self-identity. There is a need to define them (the other) in relation to us (humans). And it is the relation between them and us that shapes the identity of both. As Ellen Muehlberger captured in one of the best essays of the book, on angels, ancient people framed reality in ontological circles. While angels, or demons, or emperors were different from me (the common person), they were also like me. But the key point here is that the interaction between these different beings would challenge and transform each other. So, reflecting upon these categories and relations created the possibility of transformation. In other words, the ancient reflection on angels was a reflection on how humans could exceed their expectations, or the rabbis' reflection on artifacts in relation to humans would make human personality extend to objects. As Marx and others postulated, a thing and our ideas of it are extensions of our humanity.

Thus, the way ancient people dealt with their notions of demons, emperors, or clerics was "inherently metaphorical" and about classification, as Gleason synthetizes in her summary article in the afterword. Classifications, however, were "a matter not just of boundaries but also of connection" (287). In the Ancient world, everything was connected differently than the modern compartmentalized approach to understanding reality. I think this is one of the most important lessons the ancients can help us understand, the importance of connections in a complex world. Globalization, with the Internet, has rescued this approach to understanding reality, and I expect that this will have longstanding relevance.

Late Ancient Knowing is not like an encyclopedia or a dictionary that tries to define terms and concepts objectively in order to be consulted quickly. The essays are about specific themes which are explained through subjective lenses. By subjective I mean through the eyes of somebody who lived in Late Antiquity. Most of the articles are written from this perspective of listening carefully to the ancient sources in order to understand the past. As a consequence of this historical methodology—intended or not—few authors use etymology to clarify their themes. Late Ancient medicine, artifacts, and demons are revealed to the postmodern reader, as much as possible, through the recorded experiences of those who lived with the ancient demons and artifacts. The book thus reconstructs this historical past not with an evolutionistic bias of judging the past negatively, by defining precisely the past

in comparison with the present, but its authors are positive and sympathetic to ancient voices. I try to do the same in my review, highlighting what I found most important for a student of Christian history and theology, giving just one or two ideas about each essay. Knowing the past sympathetically can teach us to be more tolerant to different opinions today. Although this work may help us understand the past, it is also important to recognize our limitations in recovering how ancient people lived and thought. This is because the data we have from this period of history (as any other) is not comprehensive. Our reconstructions should be treated as tentative, as Maud Gleason articulates nicely in the afterword.

This review is from the perspective of how this book can be useful for teaching, for I believe worldview formation is the goal of education. And since Judeo-Christian documents have played a major role in shaping Western civilizations and modern thought, it is especially important for Christians to understand the society of the formative periods of our faith. Pastor-teachers will find these essays on ancient epistemology very useful for teaching. I read this book with this goal in mind, and the immediate questions that I imagined my students asking were, What is Late Ancient? and When was it? The book does not give a precise answer to this inquiry, maybe because no clear historical boundaries can be set. Most authors focus their discussion on personalities of the fourth and fifth century CE, while some explore the theme from the second to the eighth century CE.

So what are some tendencies one can perceive by reading this collection of articles about Late Ancient societies? First, that ancient knowledge is about self-identification. When Porphyry and his contemporaries wrote about medicine or the rabbis about artifacts of life, they were also writing as much (and maybe more so) about themselves. The reflection on the "other," be it angels, gods, animals, emperor, or demons helped ancient humans to create self-identity. Another tendency I noticed by reading this book was to see how Porphyry (ca. 234–305) seems to be a main representative thinker of antiquity. He is clearly the main author described in chapters two to four, and he appears in other chapters as well. These chapters could be easily used to introduce Porphyry's ideas in comparison with Christian thinkers of the same period to teach how Christian faith developed along the ideas systematized by this pagan philosopher. In contrast, I noticed that Paul and his anthropology, with the concept of the human nature of sin, is absent in the discussion of the whole book. Since most articles are about Christian themes and perspectives on epistemology, this extremely important worldview could have been a helpful part of the conversation about how ancients saw themselves and knew reality.

According to the introduction, written by the editors Catherine Chin and Moulie Vidas, the author of each chapter should have asked two questions about the theme explored: What did Late Ancient people know about it, and How was that knowledge expressed in people's actions? (3). This purpose is very good, but the chapters do not all answer these questions clearly. Thus, the division into two parts, *Finding Order* (chs. 1–7) and *Putting Things in Order* (chs. 8–14), seems to be unnecessary. I would place together the

chapters on demons, God, and angels, marking them as distinct from the chapters on artifact, cosmos, and language. Overall, the book approaches a somewhat neglected field in history, Late Ancient epistemology, that should be understood by those studying the origins and development of Jewish and Christian ideas, which shaped Western culture.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Rodrigo de Galiza Barbosa

deClaissé-Walford, Nancy, Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. *The Book of Psalms*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014. xxii + 1051pp. Hardcover, US$60.00.

This New International Commentary on the Old Testament (NICOT) volume on the Psalms is the result of the combined insights and expertise of three excellent biblical scholars: Nancy deClaissé-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. True to the evangelical tradition of NICOT, which delicately balances the use of standard critical methodologies with humble respect and admiration for the biblical text as God's inspired Word (xv), the authors draw on historical, form-critical, canonical, and theological approaches, and pay attention to the text's literary features, theological themes, and practical implications for the life of modern readers. The book does not delve much into technical issues (such as literary structure, date, and original setting) that are usually treated extensively in some commentaries. Rather, it focuses on the linguistic features and theological message of each psalm in particular, and the whole Psalter in general.

The authors offer a comprehensive fifty-one-page introduction to orient readers to the Psalter with regard to some key issues: the title, text, translation, authorship, superscriptions, and date of the Psalms, the main approaches to the study of the Psalms (form-critical, historical, and canonical approaches), the main poetic features of the Psalms (parallelism and evocative language), the overview of themes and theology, and the outline of the Psalter. Some issues are discussed in more detail than others. For example, the authors devote seventeen pages to the canonical shape of the Psalter (five pages to form criticism and historical approaches). This is done to both shed more light on this recent approach to the Psalms (championed in the mid-twentieth century) and set the tone for the authors' method. The authors approach the Psalter canonically, meaning that they pay careful attention to the division of the Psalter into five distinct books and its "story line" (from the reign of King David through the Babylonian exile to the return to the land and rebuilding of the temple). This reviewer believes that certain matters deserve additional attention in the introduction. For example, themes and theology of the Psalms are given only two pages. The authors provide a helpful overview of leading scholars and their methods and approaches to the theology of the Psalter, but this book would have been enriched by a fresh exposition of the theology of the Psalter that would demonstrate the dynamic of the encounter and fellowship between God and his people in the Psalms. The introduction comes with a useful five-page bibliography of secondary sources.

chapters on demons, God, and angels, marking them as distinct from the chapters on artifact, cosmos, and language. Overall, the book approaches a somewhat neglected field in history, Late Ancient epistemology, that should be understood by those studying the origins and development of Jewish and Christian ideas, which shaped Western culture.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Rodrigo de Galiza Barbosa

deClaissé-Walford, Nancy, Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. *The Book of Psalms*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014. xxii + 1051pp. Hardcover, US$60.00.

This New International Commentary on the Old Testament (NICOT) volume on the Psalms is the result of the combined insights and expertise of three excellent biblical scholars: Nancy deClaissé-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. True to the evangelical tradition of NICOT, which delicately balances the use of standard critical methodologies with humble respect and admiration for the biblical text as God's inspired Word (xv), the authors draw on historical, form-critical, canonical, and theological approaches, and pay attention to the text's literary features, theological themes, and practical implications for the life of modern readers. The book does not delve much into technical issues (such as literary structure, date, and original setting) that are usually treated extensively in some commentaries. Rather, it focuses on the linguistic features and theological message of each psalm in particular, and the whole Psalter in general.

The authors offer a comprehensive fifty-one-page introduction to orient readers to the Psalter with regard to some key issues: the title, text, translation, authorship, superscriptions, and date of the Psalms, the main approaches to the study of the Psalms (form-critical, historical, and canonical approaches), the main poetic features of the Psalms (parallelism and evocative language), the overview of themes and theology, and the outline of the Psalter. Some issues are discussed in more detail than others. For example, the authors devote seventeen pages to the canonical shape of the Psalter (five pages to form criticism and historical approaches). This is done to both shed more light on this recent approach to the Psalms (championed in the mid-twentieth century) and set the tone for the authors' method. The authors approach the Psalter canonically, meaning that they pay careful attention to the division of the Psalter into five distinct books and its "story line" (from the reign of King David through the Babylonian exile to the return to the land and rebuilding of the temple). This reviewer believes that certain matters deserve additional attention in the introduction. For example, themes and theology of the Psalms are given only two pages. The authors provide a helpful overview of leading scholars and their methods and approaches to the theology of the Psalter, but this book would have been enriched by a fresh exposition of the theology of the Psalter that would demonstrate the dynamic of the encounter and fellowship between God and his people in the Psalms. The introduction comes with a useful five-page bibliography of secondary sources.

The main body of the book consists of introductions to each of the five books of the Psalter, and translations and analyses of the psalms. The introductions provide brief overviews of the psalms in the book, psalm superscriptions, prevalent psalm genre(s), psalm collections, and reflections on the possible reasons of the editor(s) of the present Psalter in grouping certain psalms together or in a particular order (the canonical shape of the book). A new translation of each psalm is given that settles on the Masoretic text, but also takes special account of the Dead Sea Scrolls. One peculiarity of this commentary is that the authors have opted not to translate the Hebrew term *khesed* (loving-kindness, steadfast love), but simply to transliterate *hesed* and treat it as a loanword from Hebrew to English (similar to "shalom") because there is no English term that can adequately render the full meaning of this important Hebrew word (7–8).

This book differs from other traditional commentaries in that it pays special attention to the canonical shape of the present Psalter and the role each psalm plays in it. This means that the authors approach the Psalter as a book with a unified message, and seek to discover the purposeful arrangement of the psalms within the collection and understand the message of each psalm in the context of the surrounding psalms and the entire Psalter. The authors believe that the story of the shaping of the Psalter narrates the history of ancient Israel, from the reigns of Kings David and Solomon (Books One and Two), the dark days of the divided kingdoms and their eventual destruction (Book Three), the years of Babylonian exile during which the people of Israel had to rethink their identity as the people of God (Book IV), and the days of restoration and postexilic Israel (Book V) (38). A number of clues in the Psalms point to a possible underlying narrative behind the present Psalter. Books One and Two focus on King David, whose name appears in most psalm superscriptions; the temple; and Ps 72 ("a psalm of Solomon"). Book Three seems to tell that the main pillars that represented ancient Israel's national and religious identity (the temple, the king, and the land) have collapsed (e.g., Pss 74, 79, 89). The canonical placement of the royal psalms suggests they are arranged to promote the rule of God that is most clearly voiced in Pss 93–99. Although the human component of the covenant failed, the people could rest in assurance of the unchanging purposes of God through the Davidic King, the Messiah. Books IV and V continue in this emphasis on the renewed and complete reliance on the Lord. The language of some psalms strongly suggests a postexilic setting for the Psalter (e.g., Ps 107:3). The authors build their theological analysis of the psalms on the observations of W. Brueggemann, J. Clinton McCann, James L. Mays, Harry P. Nasuti, James A. Sanders, and others. Readers who are familiar with the canonical approach will appreciate the theological insights of this book (see 21–38).

It is certainly refreshing to read a book on the Psalms that does not give the majority of its space to the disciplines of textual, source, form, and redactional criticism, but rather focuses on the final form of the Psalms and their theological message for the communities of faith in history and today. This book's study of the Psalms in their canonical placement is insightful. This

is one of the main strengths of this book. Yet, sometimes the authors assume the accuracy of "the story of the Psalter" (398), rather than demonstrate it clearly from the biblical text. For example, it is not always apparent from the analysis of Pss 107–150 that "Book Five of the Psalter tells the story of ancient Israel as it returned from exile in Babylon" (989). In this way, readers are challenged to further advance the study of the canonical shape of the Psalter.

The writers of the New Testament extensively quote the Psalms, and the authors of this book duly note and comment on the main instances. In the concluding comments on most psalms the authors seek to demonstrate the transforming power and beauty of the psalms in the context of the Christian message. Readers will appreciate hearing the psalms speak to the world today. Yet, some readers interested particularly in the NT interpretation of certain psalm quotes and the messianic psalms (e.g., Pss 16, 110) may wish that the authors offered more elaborate interpretation of the NT use of psalms.

The gender-inclusive language of the book is commendable, but the constant reference to the psalmist as both "he" and "she" will be distracting to some readers, especially for the psalms which are traditionally attributed to David and Asaph. Also, occasional typographical mistakes may be frustrating (for example, on p. 153 readers are directed to see n. 9 for a suffix supplied by LXX, but the information is given in n. 6). In addition, this work offers a very helpful index of authors, names and subjects, and Scripture and other ancient literature.

This minor critique of the book should by no means cast any depreciating shadow on this outstanding work on the Psalms. Readers will find the commentaries on the Psalms insightful and immensely enriching. It is no wonder that several eminent Old Testament and Psalms scholars have praised the book, including John Goldingay, W. H. Bellinger Jr., Patrick D. Miller, Erhard Gerstenberger, and J. Clinton McCann Jr. This book is a fine tool for use by laypersons, students, scholars, and pastors.

Washington Adventist University Dragoslava Santrac
Takoma Park, Maryland

Elliott, J. K. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. 3rd ed. NovTSup 160. Leiden: Brill, 2015. xliii + 408 pp. Hardcover, US$149.00.

James Keith Elliott is currently honorary professor of New Testament textual criticism at the University of Leeds. His recent publication, N*ew Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. *NovTSup* 137 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), that contains thirty-two of the fifty-seven articles he published over the past forty years in several journals and books, bears witness not only to the expertise of this giant in the field, but also to his methodology. By using "thoroughgoing eclecticism" Elliott is walking in the footsteps of George Kilpatrick, C. H. Turner, and A. C. Clark.

is one of the main strengths of this book. Yet, sometimes the authors assume the accuracy of "the story of the Psalter" (398), rather than demonstrate it clearly from the biblical text. For example, it is not always apparent from the analysis of Pss 107–150 that "Book Five of the Psalter tells the story of ancient Israel as it returned from exile in Babylon" (989). In this way, readers are challenged to further advance the study of the canonical shape of the Psalter.

The writers of the New Testament extensively quote the Psalms, and the authors of this book duly note and comment on the main instances. In the concluding comments on most psalms the authors seek to demonstrate the transforming power and beauty of the psalms in the context of the Christian message. Readers will appreciate hearing the psalms speak to the world today. Yet, some readers interested particularly in the NT interpretation of certain psalm quotes and the messianic psalms (e.g., Pss 16, 110) may wish that the authors offered more elaborate interpretation of the NT use of psalms.

The gender-inclusive language of the book is commendable, but the constant reference to the psalmist as both "he" and "she" will be distracting to some readers, especially for the psalms which are traditionally attributed to David and Asaph. Also, occasional typographical mistakes may be frustrating (for example, on p. 153 readers are directed to see n. 9 for a suffix supplied by LXX, but the information is given in n. 6). In addition, this work offers a very helpful index of authors, names and subjects, and Scripture and other ancient literature.

This minor critique of the book should by no means cast any depreciating shadow on this outstanding work on the Psalms. Readers will find the commentaries on the Psalms insightful and immensely enriching. It is no wonder that several eminent Old Testament and Psalms scholars have praised the book, including John Goldingay, W. H. Bellinger Jr., Patrick D. Miller, Erhard Gerstenberger, and J. Clinton McCann Jr. This book is a fine tool for use by laypersons, students, scholars, and pastors.

Washington Adventist University Dragoslava Santrac
Takoma Park, Maryland

Elliott, J. K. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. 3rd ed. NovTSup 160. Leiden: Brill, 2015. xliii + 408 pp. Hardcover, US$149.00.

James Keith Elliott is currently honorary professor of New Testament textual criticism at the University of Leeds. His recent publication, N*ew Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. *NovTSup* 137 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), that contains thirty-two of the fifty-seven articles he published over the past forty years in several journals and books, bears witness not only to the expertise of this giant in the field, but also to his methodology. By using "thoroughgoing eclecticism" Elliott is walking in the footsteps of George Kilpatrick, C. H. Turner, and A. C. Clark.

Two editions (*SNTSMS* 62, [1989]; *SNTSMS* 109, [2000]) and three supplements (*NovT* 46.4, [2005]: 376–400; *NovT* 49.4 [2007]: 370–401; *NovT* 52.3, [2010]: 272–297) preceded the recent expanded and revised edition of *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. The table of contents of the third edition shows that the appendix, which was added in the second edition to the introduction (13–17) was not only significantly expanded by adding bibliographical data on "Guides to Various Approaches to Transcriptional Probability," "Collected Essays," and "URLs," but was also relocated to the end of the book (401–408). The section on unregistered manuscripts, located at the end of the second edition, was no longer maintained in the third edition, since these manuscripts either got registered or disqualified for a Gregory number (408).

The third edition starts with the acknowledgment (vii), followed by an extensive list of abbreviations (viii–xliii). In the introduction (1–12), Elliott states that the bibliography "contains details of articles, studies and collations of manuscripts, including those dealing with text, illustrations and palaeography" (1). The actual bibliography is divided into four major parts, according to the Gregory-Aland numbering system: Papyri (13–50), Majuscules (51–128), Minuscules (129–328), and Lectionaries (329–399). As in the earlier editions, he "tended to avoid references to short notes in learned journals or in commentaries on Biblical books that treat of an isolated textual variant read by particular manuscripts" (2).

Regarding the bibliography, major changes were made in comparison to the earlier editions. The bibliographical entries are now listed for each manuscript in descending order of the publication date, which means the most recent publication is listed first. Short introduction paragraphs for important manuscripts as they appeared in the second edition are removed in the current edition. Also the considerable increase of the book's size from 5.5 x 8.75 to 6.25 x 9.5 inches, which results from the change of the publisher and the series, allows for a clearer layout and better readability. However, there is more room for improvement regarding the layout of the bibliographic data. The layout is according to the standard format of bibliographic entries in biblical studies, having runover lines indented for general reference works in the beginning of each chapter, but not for the bibliographic entries for each manuscript. The decision to use the same line spacing between two entries and runover lines for longer entries makes it even harder to identify the beginning of each entry. Thus, regarding readability, this bibliography is still insufficient.

Another novelty of the current edition is its link to BiBIL, an online bibliographical resource, maintained by the University of Lausanne (CH). This move by Elliott is definitely worth it. However, I question the value of the bibliography in print form, since especially the discipline of textual criticism is taking more and more advantage of computer technology as well as the Internet. Spot-checking the webpage of the Institut für Neustamentliche Textforschung (INTF), http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste, for certain manuscripts, the provided bibliography for each manuscript seems to be mostly congruent or even more comprehensive than Elliott's bibliography.

The advantage of the online database provided by INTF is that detailed information and sometimes even images or transcriptions, are provided for each manuscript, in addition to the bibliography. To compete with this online tool by printed media will probably become impossible in the near future. However, as long as differences in their bibliographical data appear, one or the other tool remains valuable.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Dominic Bornand

Flemming, Dean. *Why Mission?* Reframing New Testament Theology. Nashville: Abingdon, 2015. 173 pp. Softcover, US$29.99.

Flemming's book, *Why Mission?*, is part of the Reframing New Testament Theology series edited by Joel B. Green. The series seeks to address the question, "What does it mean to engage the New Testament from within the church and for the church?" (xi). For Flemming, this broad question is focused on "What is God's mission for communities of faith?"

In chapter one, "Reading from the Back: Mission in Matthew," Flemming argues that Matthew's witness to the *missio Dei* must be understood in light of the organic unity between the story of Israel and the story of Jesus: "What God has done in Jesus of Nazareth is the climax of Israel's story and the fulfillment of Israel's Scriptures" (3). Jesus' renewal and restoration of Israel can be seen in his comprehensive kingdom mission where he teaches, preaches, heals, and confronts expressions of evil at every turn.

Since the post-resurrection commission of Jesus (Matt 28:16–20) is the climax of the first gospel, one must read Matthew "from the back." The Great Commission recapitulates and gathers together the primary theological themes of the gospel; it shaped how Matthew's Jewish Christian community read and understood the gospel; and it helps contemporary Christians "to grasp how Matthew's Gospel . . . equips God's people to participate in the *missio Dei*" (12).

In chapter two, "A Mission of Divine Embrace: Luke and Acts," Flemming maintains that Luke's purpose in writing Luke-Acts is to depict God's redemptive project for the entire world: Luke-Acts is "a narrative of God's saving mission, which is unfolded in Israel's Scriptures, the life and mission of Jesus, and the Spirit propelled Christian community" (24). God's saving mission is all-embracing, boundary-breaking, and Spirit-empowered.

The narrative of Luke–Acts should be understood as an instrument of the divine mission, inviting present-day missional communities to actualize the mission to bring the fullness of salvation to all nations in their own concrete settings. The mission of Jesus to proclaim good news to the poor, and release to the captives and oppressed, is our calling as well. And the church's Spirit-empowered witness—revealed in the speeches to Jewish and Gentile audiences and in unified loving community—also become models for the contemporary church to emulate.

In chapter three, "Sent into the World: Mission in John," Flemming claims the Fourth Gospel may well offer "the most developed theological

The advantage of the online database provided by INTF is that detailed information and sometimes even images or transcriptions, are provided for each manuscript, in addition to the bibliography. To compete with this online tool by printed media will probably become impossible in the near future. However, as long as differences in their bibliographical data appear, one or the other tool remains valuable.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Dominic Bornand

Flemming, Dean. *Why Mission?* Reframing New Testament Theology. Nashville: Abingdon, 2015. 173 pp. Softcover, US$29.99.

Flemming's book, *Why Mission?*, is part of the Reframing New Testament Theology series edited by Joel B. Green. The series seeks to address the question, "What does it mean to engage the New Testament from within the church and for the church?" (xi). For Flemming, this broad question is focused on "What is God's mission for communities of faith?"

In chapter one, "Reading from the Back: Mission in Matthew," Flemming argues that Matthew's witness to the *missio Dei* must be understood in light of the organic unity between the story of Israel and the story of Jesus: "What God has done in Jesus of Nazareth is the climax of Israel's story and the fulfillment of Israel's Scriptures" (3). Jesus' renewal and restoration of Israel can be seen in his comprehensive kingdom mission where he teaches, preaches, heals, and confronts expressions of evil at every turn.

Since the post-resurrection commission of Jesus (Matt 28:16–20) is the climax of the first gospel, one must read Matthew "from the back." The Great Commission recapitulates and gathers together the primary theological themes of the gospel; it shaped how Matthew's Jewish Christian community read and understood the gospel; and it helps contemporary Christians "to grasp how Matthew's Gospel . . . equips God's people to participate in the *missio Dei*" (12).

In chapter two, "A Mission of Divine Embrace: Luke and Acts," Flemming maintains that Luke's purpose in writing Luke-Acts is to depict God's redemptive project for the entire world: Luke-Acts is "a narrative of God's saving mission, which is unfolded in Israel's Scriptures, the life and mission of Jesus, and the Spirit propelled Christian community" (24). God's saving mission is all-embracing, boundary-breaking, and Spirit-empowered.

The narrative of Luke–Acts should be understood as an instrument of the divine mission, inviting present-day missional communities to actualize the mission to bring the fullness of salvation to all nations in their own concrete settings. The mission of Jesus to proclaim good news to the poor, and release to the captives and oppressed, is our calling as well. And the church's Spirit-empowered witness—revealed in the speeches to Jewish and Gentile audiences and in unified loving community—also become models for the contemporary church to emulate.

In chapter three, "Sent into the World: Mission in John," Flemming claims the Fourth Gospel may well offer "the most developed theological

understanding of mission" among the gospels (53). The Triune God's cosmic purpose for the entire creation (John 1:1–18) is fulfilled in the eternal Word, his only Son, Jesus, who actualizes God's mission through his incarnation, manifesting "an embodied presence of the loving, seeking God" (55). The mission is publicly revealed by Jesus' words and deeds; his words are focused not on the kingdom of God but upon himself and the life he came to offer; his deeds are miraculous signs that "reveal God's glory and lead people to put their faith in Jesus" (56). Divine love is the motive and character of God's mission; this love reaches across numerous boundaries and is preeminently expressed upon the cross—an act of self-giving love that provides a portrait of what "loving to the end" involves. The Spirit imparts life to all who believe; bears witness to Jesus; empowers his followers for witness; and convicts, and exposes the sin of the world.

In chapter four, "Living out the Story: Mission in Philippians," Flemming examines Philippians as a "case study for reading Paul's letters through missional eyes" (73). He considers the letter as a product of, witness to, and instrument of God's mission. Philippians can be contextualized to equip contemporary Christian communities to participate in God's mission. The epistle entreats the church to embody God's mission as united, holy, and loving communities; to proclaim and live out the gospel of Jesus Christ; and to critically engage our cultures, celebrating "what is true and beautiful in our cultures," yet not embracing their values uncritically (88). In short, under the guidance of the Spirit, the community must "reenact the self-giving story of Christ" (88).

In chapter five, "Mission for Misfits: A Missional Reading of 1 Peter," Flemming notes the letter depicts the identity of Christians as aliens and strangers in a hostile world (1 Pet 2:11). In such an unfriendly world, Christian communities witness to God's mission by participating in the grand story of God's reconciling work in Christ on behalf of humanity and the world; the story, which includes the story of Israel, "sweeps from creation to the consummation of all things" (90) and is utilized by Peter to inscribe and encourage the church to be caught up in this divine drama of salvation.

Peter draws on Israel's identity-shaping experience as a "holy priesthood" and a "holy nation" to encourage the church to be a distinctive, God-reflecting community that displays "the self-giving love of Christ" (98); the church is called to engage the world for the sake of others, mediating the blessings of the abundant, transformed life of God's salvation.

In chapter six, "The Triumph of the *Missio Dei*: Mission in Revelation," Flemming argues that Revelation is interpreted more faithfully when it is not culled for missionary texts (e.g., Rev 5:9; 7:9; 14:6), but approached with an understanding that the *entire book* is a mission text. This apocalyptic book narrates the climax of "the sweeping story of God's purpose to redeem and form a missional people and to restore all things" (110). This grand story consists of several interrelated stories—creation/new creation, redemption, judgment, and God's people.

The Apocalypse of John is intended to be a community-shaping text, inspiring Christian communities not to accommodate to the dominant Roman culture, but to give ultimate allegiance to the Lamb of God and offer the sovereign God faithful worship and witness. Revelation reimages the world for believers, offering them a vision that contrasts sharply the deceptive imperial worldview of Rome over against the vision of God's restoration of the world.

In the Epilogue, Flemming addresses three issues. First, he gives a brief overview of the distinctive missional notes of the New Testament writings he examined. Second, he sketches a number of missional themes that run through the New Testament's testimony to God's mission and its call for Christian communities to embrace God's mission. Third, he appeals for Christian communities to read Scripture faithfully, actively participating in God's mission by contextualizing the missional intent of the New Testament for their own unique circumstances.

Flemming's interpretations of God's mission are exegetically informed and clearly written; they offer the reader accessible reflections of seven representative New Testament writings on the *missio Dei*. Aside from desiring Flemming to have engaged the Gospel of Mark, thereby giving the reader missional readings of the four canonical Gospels, I have one criticism: instead of sketching sixteen common missional themes of the New Testament in the Epilogue (132–134), it would have been helpful had Flemming wrestled with the divergent voices and offered a proposal for coherence among the various witnesses. Is there a theme(s) which comprehensively captures God's mission in the New Testament? Or, is there a unity of missional perspective within the diverse voices of the New Testament? Nonetheless, the book admirably fulfills its purpose for the Reframing New Testament Theology series stated at the outset: "intended for people interested in studying the New Testament and the nature of the Christian message and the Christian life, for classrooms, group interaction, and personal study, these volumes invite readers into a conversation with New Testament theology" (xi).

Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, California

Leo Ranzolin, Jr.

Hafemann, Scott J. *Paul's Message and Ministry in Covenant Perspective: Selected Essays*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015. 226 pp. Softcover, US$22.40.

Paul's Message and Ministry in Covenant Perspective by Scott J. Hafemann, reader in New Testament at St. Mary's College, School of Divinity, at the University of St. Andrews (Scotland), highlights the new covenant as the hermeneutical key to understanding Paul's thought and work. His helpful brief review of dominant nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarly interpretations of Paul (ch. 1) sets the context for his own thesis that Paul's message and ministry cannot be rightly understood apart from his conviction that he was the apostle of "the new covenant of the new creation" which was inaugurated by the "substitutionary atonement of Christ's death on the cross" (61, 18). The evidence Paul advanced for his conviction, according to

The Apocalypse of John is intended to be a community-shaping text, inspiring Christian communities not to accommodate to the dominant Roman culture, but to give ultimate allegiance to the Lamb of God and offer the sovereign God faithful worship and witness. Revelation reimages the world for believers, offering them a vision that contrasts sharply the deceptive imperial worldview of Rome over against the vision of God's restoration of the world.

In the Epilogue, Flemming addresses three issues. First, he gives a brief overview of the distinctive missional notes of the New Testament writings he examined. Second, he sketches a number of missional themes that run through the New Testament's testimony to God's mission and its call for Christian communities to embrace God's mission. Third, he appeals for Christian communities to read Scripture faithfully, actively participating in God's mission by contextualizing the missional intent of the New Testament for their own unique circumstances.

Flemming's interpretations of God's mission are exegetically informed and clearly written; they offer the reader accessible reflections of seven representative New Testament writings on the *missio Dei*. Aside from desiring Flemming to have engaged the Gospel of Mark, thereby giving the reader missional readings of the four canonical Gospels, I have one criticism: instead of sketching sixteen common missional themes of the New Testament in the Epilogue (132–134), it would have been helpful had Flemming wrestled with the divergent voices and offered a proposal for coherence among the various witnesses. Is there a theme(s) which comprehensively captures God's mission in the New Testament? Or, is there a unity of missional perspective within the diverse voices of the New Testament? Nonetheless, the book admirably fulfills its purpose for the Reframing New Testament Theology series stated at the outset: "intended for people interested in studying the New Testament and the nature of the Christian message and the Christian life, for classrooms, group interaction, and personal study, these volumes invite readers into a conversation with New Testament theology" (xi).

Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, California

Leo Ranzolin, Jr.

Hafemann, Scott J. *Paul's Message and Ministry in Covenant Perspective: Selected Essays*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015. 226 pp. Softcover, US$22.40.

Paul's Message and Ministry in Covenant Perspective by Scott J. Hafemann, reader in New Testament at St. Mary's College, School of Divinity, at the University of St. Andrews (Scotland), highlights the new covenant as the hermeneutical key to understanding Paul's thought and work. His helpful brief review of dominant nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarly interpretations of Paul (ch. 1) sets the context for his own thesis that Paul's message and ministry cannot be rightly understood apart from his conviction that he was the apostle of "the new covenant of the new creation" which was inaugurated by the "substitutionary atonement of Christ's death on the cross" (61, 18). The evidence Paul advanced for his conviction, according to

Hafemann, was twofold: first, Paul's own voluntary suffering "confirmed that the new age had in fact dawned" (130), and second, the "the determinative role played by the Spirit" both in Paul's own ministry and in the lives of those he ministered to was the evidentiary "mark of the new covenant" (164). Hafemann grounds his paradigm primarily, though not exclusively, in 2 Corinthians, especially in 2:14–3:18, as the core "framework of Paul's thought" (49–52, 73) and in 4:1–18 as also the framework for Paul's ministry (53–61).

For Hafemann, Paul's suffering carried immense theological significance as "part of the divine plan for the spread of the gospel" (128). God's miraculous deliverances at times when Paul was near death, coupled with Paul's own attitude in the midst of his suffering, made Paul's suffering the "revelatory vehicle" through which God authenticated "the significance of the cross" and "the power of the resurrection" to Paul's audiences (69, 125–126, 128). I have gained much from the contribution Hafemann has made to the meaning of Paul's suffering (he has also written two previous books on the subject). Hafemann extrapolates by indicting modern ministers who portray "contemporary images of the "Spirit-filled' Christian" through a "health-and-wealth gospel" (147), and contends that the modern minister is called to a unique role of suffering that s/he might thereby model a Christian response to suffering that when "replicated in the faith of his people in the midst of their own sufferings, is the primary way God grows his church" (148–149). While I resonate with that sentiment, I remain unconvinced that it represents God's primary way of growing His church.

Hafemann connects Paul's suffering to his theme of the new covenant by portraying it "as the means for mediating the transforming work of the Spirit" (147), who is "the mark of the new covenant" (164), and "whose presence among us is made possible by the cross" (173). He acknowledges that all of the Christian graces by which salvation is made accessible to the believer—"God's justifying and sanctifying work in the lives of his people," "bringing one to Christ for the forgiveness of sins that makes the new life of the 'new creation' possible," the ability to "swear allegiance to Christ and remain faithful to him" (159)—are "*brought about and guaranteed by the presence of power of the Spirit*" (159, all emphases within quotes are original with Hafemann). He makes no attempt to explain where this position would leave someone living in the OT era needing access to those same spiritual graces that they might be saved. Modern theology tends to discount that component of progressive revelation that affirms that spiritual truths do not suddenly spring into existence at the time in Scripture and history when they are first explicitly revealed. God was forgiving people long before His forgiving grace was first explicitly revealed in the law (Exod 34:6–7). "[Saving] grace was given us in Christ Jesus before the beginning of time, but it has now been revealed through the appearing of our Savior, Christ Jesus" (2 Tim 1:8–10). The same was true of all the spiritual graces administered by the Spirit for the purpose of salvation; they were being administered "from the beginning" of the post-fall era, else how could anyone have been saved before the NT era. If the Spirit is

"the mark of the new covenant," then some dimensions of the new covenant, including the presence of the Spirit, must necessarily have preceded the death of Christ, a fact not acknowledged by Hafemann and most contemporary biblical scholars.

Hafemann further describes the new covenant by a series of similarities and contrasts it bears to the old Sinai covenant. Similarities include: both covenants are based on "the same law" (156), namely, the commandments of the Torah" (98); in both "the covenantal relationship between God and his people is maintained by keeping the law in response to God's prior acts of redemption" (156); and in both "what 'counts' is . . . 'keeping the commandments of God' as a result of knowing him" (159).

Among Hafemann's long list of contrasts, two warrant particular attention in this review: the role of the Spirit and the heart condition of the people in both covenants. In short, based on Hafemann's interpretation of 2 Cor 3, "Moses was called to mediate the law to a stiff-necked people who could not obey it" (164), for "*sin* . . . [was] engraved upon the tablet of their heart' (Jer 17:1)" (154), "so that, without the Spirit, the law remained merely a 'letter' that 'kills' as part of a 'ministry of death' and 'condemnation' (2 Cor 3:6–7, 9)" (49–50). The law of God was experienced in the OT era as simply "the 'letter'—that is, the law without the Spirit—which brings death and condemnation" (111–112). "In stark contrast, under the 'new covenant' Paul has been called to mediate God's will to a people whose hearts have been 'given life' by the Spirit as part of a 'ministry of the Spirit' and 'righteousness' (3:3, 6, 8–9)" (49–50). Hafemann, who assesses that Paul's view of the law is "currently the most debated topic among Pauline scholars" (13), holds that 2 Cor 3 presents Paul's view of the law, as experienced by those under the old covenant, as "the law *without the Spirit*," in contrast to "the law *with the Spirit*, as now experienced by those under the new covenant brought about by (the) Christ" (164). Given these extreme contrasts, Hafemann's exclusively historical perspective of the covenants—the old covenant operating exclusively in the OT era, and new covenant exclusively in the NT era—raises further questions of how anyone in the OT era could have been converted and saved. Until theologians grasp the experiential dimension of the old and new covenants, namely, that Paul treats human rejection or perversion of the gospel in any historical era as "old covenant," and a response of faith and the obedience that issues from faith in any historical era as "new covenant," a coherent theology of the covenants will continue to elude biblical scholarship.

Paul, says Hafemann, considered that the Spirit-generated transformed hearts of the Corinthians, compared to the hardened hearts of those who lived without the Spirit under the Sinai covenant (56–57), was a major evidence both that the new creation of the new covenant had dawned at the death of Christ, and that "the effects of the fall are now being reversed through Paul's apostolic ministry" (61). "The saving power of the cross" is demonstrated in a tangible way through "the unity of the church in worship and love" (183). This can only happen if church members are experiencing "*continuing* conversion" (186, 192), "*increasing* conformity to the image of Christ" (104),

"and increasing obedience" (192)—evidences that reveal whether or not someone is among the truly elect (192). Writing from a Reformed perspective, Hafemann says these characteristics are not based on church members' "own decision or fortitude, but [on] God's self-generated eternal decree, which unleashes a chain of consequences that begins with God's foreknowledge and predestination and climaxes with their glorification" (100), leaving "no excuse for . . . continuing, habitual disobedience" (159). One wishes Hafemann would have provided tangible examples of what "*continuing* conversion," "*increasing* conformity to the image of Christ," and "increasing obedience" look like in the real world—continually increased giving to charity, Bible reading, prayer, involvement in Matt 25:31–45-type activities? And if these same qualities were also evidence of election in the OT era, how could they have been manifested in one's life apart from the presence of the Spirit who purportedly came after the cross?

Hafemann is to be commended for his well-argued insistence that Paul's message and ministry are grounded in the new covenant, though it would have been an even more coherent defense had he integrated the experiential dimension of the covenants. He also includes many additional insights that this brief review could not explore but that readers will find valuable on themes that are tangentially related to his primary thesis—e.g., his exegesis of Exod 32–34 of the meaning of Moses's "veil" as Paul used it in his argument on the covenants (2 Cor 3:13–18), his assessment that Paul's assurance of the Second Coming of Christ formed "the foundation and motivation" for his "insistence on . . . ethical transformation" (189), and so forth. Scholars will appreciate this book, which attempts to integrate many of Hafemann's written works on Paul into a unified covenant perspective.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Skip MacCarty

Jassen, Alex P. *Scripture and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. xxii + 298 pp. Hardcover, US$80.00.

In what way do the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) adapt and expand the legal content of passages taken by them as authoritative Scripture? What constitutes authoritative Scripture for them? Do they see a difference in authority between various texts seen by them as Scripture? What hermeneutic strategies and exegetical techniques do they employ when they reuse scriptural legal passages? And how do the DSS fit into legal discussions in ancient Israel? These are key questions as Jassen develops his arguments in his rich and penetrating book, *Scripture and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The book provides a valuable contribution to the study of legal texts among the DSS, a study that only recently is beginning to receive the attention it deserves in scholarship.

The first third of the book gives a very valuable overview of research done on the legal discussions in the DSS and how the concept of authoritative Scripture developed. Over one hundred pages follow that are devoted to Isa 58:13 and the Sabbath restrictions against speech and thoughts of labor in the DSS and their contemporary Jewish milieu. Then some forty pages are

"and increasing obedience" (192)—evidences that reveal whether or not someone is among the truly elect (192). Writing from a Reformed perspective, Hafemann says these characteristics are not based on church members' "own decision or fortitude, but [on] God's self-generated eternal decree, which unleashes a chain of consequences that begins with God's foreknowledge and predestination and climaxes with their glorification" (100), leaving "no excuse for . . . continuing, habitual disobedience" (159). One wishes Hafemann would have provided tangible examples of what "*continuing* conversion," "*increasing* conformity to the image of Christ," and "increasing obedience" look like in the real world—continually increased giving to charity, Bible reading, prayer, involvement in Matt 25:31–45-type activities? And if these same qualities were also evidence of election in the OT era, how could they have been manifested in one's life apart from the presence of the Spirit who purportedly came after the cross?

Hafemann is to be commended for his well-argued insistence that Paul's message and ministry are grounded in the new covenant, though it would have been an even more coherent defense had he integrated the experiential dimension of the covenants. He also includes many additional insights that this brief review could not explore but that readers will find valuable on themes that are tangentially related to his primary thesis—e.g., his exegesis of Exod 32–34 of the meaning of Moses's "veil" as Paul used it in his argument on the covenants (2 Cor 3:13–18), his assessment that Paul's assurance of the Second Coming of Christ formed "the foundation and motivation" for his "insistence on . . . ethical transformation" (189), and so forth. Scholars will appreciate this book, which attempts to integrate many of Hafemann's written works on Paul into a unified covenant perspective.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Skip MacCarty

Jassen, Alex P. *Scripture and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. xxii + 298 pp. Hardcover, US$80.00.

In what way do the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) adapt and expand the legal content of passages taken by them as authoritative Scripture? What constitutes authoritative Scripture for them? Do they see a difference in authority between various texts seen by them as Scripture? What hermeneutic strategies and exegetical techniques do they employ when they reuse scriptural legal passages? And how do the DSS fit into legal discussions in ancient Israel? These are key questions as Jassen develops his arguments in his rich and penetrating book, *Scripture and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The book provides a valuable contribution to the study of legal texts among the DSS, a study that only recently is beginning to receive the attention it deserves in scholarship.

The first third of the book gives a very valuable overview of research done on the legal discussions in the DSS and how the concept of authoritative Scripture developed. Over one hundred pages follow that are devoted to Isa 58:13 and the Sabbath restrictions against speech and thoughts of labor in the DSS and their contemporary Jewish milieu. Then some forty pages are

devoted to a discussion of Jer 17:21–22 and the Sabbath carrying prohibition, and finally a chapter on the use of non-Pentateuchal passages in the same mentioned texts. Immediately, such a narrow textual scope might appear too specialized. Very soon, however, the readers see how this allows Jassen to fine-tune his discussions, leaving us with the clearest exposition of reuse in the DSS of non-Pentateuchal legal passages that I have seen. Jassen's book nicely complements other recent publications on related topics.

Having worked primarily on the intrabiblical legal reuse, it strikes me how Jassen's analysis of the DSS seems very close to what is taking place within the HB itself, while the rabbinic discussions are more removed. It seems that the cases Jassen discusses give basis for speaking of continuity rather than discontinuity between reuse of scriptural legal passages in Scripture itself compared to similar reuse in DSS. Yes, the scriptural sources are rewritten with their ambiguities being replaced by more precise locutions. On this level, Jassen points to a discontinuity. But this seems to take the form of close scribal reading to extend the scriptural passages into their own time and setting. In this way, the goal is not to undermine the scriptural authority, but rather to bring these passages into a *Lebenswelt* where they can be acted upon. On this more basic level, there is, therefore, a continuity. It is an appropriation intent to clarify practical issues of application, even when the new formulation itself might problematize the possibility of its own fulfillment. An example here would be the pious man in *Leviticus Rabbah* 34:16, who is not able to resist thinking about his vineyard on the Sabbath, as discussed by Jassen.

Bernard Levinson and Jeffrey Stackert, scholars that Jassen himself draws upon (62–64), have emphasized a "hermeneutics of concealment" in intrabiblical legal reuse, where the borrowing text usurps the authority of the scriptural source text only to replace it with concrete regulations. To me, the cases Jassen discusses, however, seem to support the view that, even when new elements are introduced or altered, the intent of the ancient Israelite scribes was to appropriate the texts, clarifying issues when needed, in order to facilitate a framework in which the community could see themselves as loyal to Torah practice. As far as I can see, Jassen's study seems to corroborate a model of continuity rather than discontinuity on the question of legal reuse in ancient Israel.

I should mention that I wanted more discussion by Jassen of how to differentiate between a shared tradition, common literary source, and direct literary reuse between two sources. Some scholars place prime emphasis upon the analysis of individual cases and the intuition of the scholar in each case to determine whether there is reuse or not. Others create a list of criteria that specific cases need to conform to in order to be said to be cases of reuse. Jassen seems closer to the former. Both approaches have their weaknesses, and, in my opinion, the better approach is possibly to be found somewhere between the two. This results in Jassen, at several points, claiming that a common lexeme (often a very frequent Hebrew word like רבד and אצי) together with a shared theme provides sufficient basis for concluding there is direct literary reuse (cf. 77, 81–82, 89, 93–95, 112, 156, 181, 187, 207, 210). In my opinion,

this is a weak basis and calls for more reflection on how scholars approach the question of literary reuse in ancient Israel. As an analogy, many scholars deny literary reuse based on comparable parallels between the eighth-century prophets (Amos, Micah, and Hosea) and Torah. This raises the questions of why we seem to find such an accumulation of more elusive cases of reuse in ancient Israelite literature, and how to deal properly with these. When are we entitled to call something literary reuse, and when not? And when can we say that differences are intentional modifications?

Jassen ends the book by writing: "Thus, even as these texts turn to scriptural material for authority, they are free to change the very wording of the authoritative texts. In so doing, the Second Temple texts are themselves contributing to the formation of the canon and its textual character. In contrast, the rabbinic approaches to many of the very same scriptural passages respect their textual integrity even as they dramatically transform their meaning and practical application through midrashic reformulation" (252). Maybe these two approaches are not best described in general through terminology such as "concealment" (62) or "subversive" (65). While some reuse may be subversive, DSS reuse through rewriting and rabbinic reuse through commentary may also reflect a deep loyalty to their sources. As it seems difficult to call everything either subversive or loyal, each case needs to be studied independently on its own merits. Further, I am somewhat unsure whether the one approach is "contributing to the formation of the canon" more than the other. The rewriting of the DSS was not included in the canon as such. And both approaches testify to the authority of their sources. While one appropriates through rewriting and the other through commentary, this difference does not itself seem to be the key to understanding canonization. Both hermeneutical approaches could have been used both in the process of canonization itself and after its completion. To me, it is not clear that DSS rewriting itself is "contributing to the formation of the canon." Rather, the accumulated attribution of authority over time seems gradually to stabilize the canon.

This said, Jassen's book is rich and thorough, and any reader interested in intrabiblical, Second Temple, or rabbinic reuse of Scripture will be rewarded in reading it.

Grimo, Norway Kenneth Bergland

Kletter, Raz, Irit Ziffer, and Wolfgang Zwickel. *Yavneh II: The 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit. Fire Pans, Kernos, Naos, Painted Stands, 'Plain' Pottery, Cypriot Pottery, Inscribed Bowl, Dog Bones, Stone Fragments, and Other Studies.* Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015. xiii + 288 pp. and 63 plates. Hardcover, SF 142.00/EUR 150.00.

The book under review represents the second and concluding volume of the final report for the well-known salvage excavation of an Iron Age IIA-B *favissa* or cultic repository pit, extremely rich in finds, discovered on a hill just north of Tel Yavneh in Israel. The first volume appeared in 2010 (for a content summary of this earlier report, see my review in *Near East Archaeological Society*

this is a weak basis and calls for more reflection on how scholars approach the question of literary reuse in ancient Israel. As an analogy, many scholars deny literary reuse based on comparable parallels between the eighth-century prophets (Amos, Micah, and Hosea) and Torah. This raises the questions of why we seem to find such an accumulation of more elusive cases of reuse in ancient Israelite literature, and how to deal properly with these. When are we entitled to call something literary reuse, and when not? And when can we say that differences are intentional modifications?

Jassen ends the book by writing: "Thus, even as these texts turn to scriptural material for authority, they are free to change the very wording of the authoritative texts. In so doing, the Second Temple texts are themselves contributing to the formation of the canon and its textual character. In contrast, the rabbinic approaches to many of the very same scriptural passages respect their textual integrity even as they dramatically transform their meaning and practical application through midrashic reformulation" (252). Maybe these two approaches are not best described in general through terminology such as "concealment" (62) or "subversive" (65). While some reuse may be subversive, DSS reuse through rewriting and rabbinic reuse through commentary may also reflect a deep loyalty to their sources. As it seems difficult to call everything either subversive or loyal, each case needs to be studied independently on its own merits. Further, I am somewhat unsure whether the one approach is "contributing to the formation of the canon" more than the other. The rewriting of the DSS was not included in the canon as such. And both approaches testify to the authority of their sources. While one appropriates through rewriting and the other through commentary, this difference does not itself seem to be the key to understanding canonization. Both hermeneutical approaches could have been used both in the process of canonization itself and after its completion. To me, it is not clear that DSS rewriting itself is "contributing to the formation of the canon." Rather, the accumulated attribution of authority over time seems gradually to stabilize the canon.

This said, Jassen's book is rich and thorough, and any reader interested in intrabiblical, Second Temple, or rabbinic reuse of Scripture will be rewarded in reading it.

Grimo, Norway Kenneth Bergland

Kletter, Raz, Irit Ziffer, and Wolfgang Zwickel. *Yavneh II: The 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit. Fire Pans, Kernos, Naos, Painted Stands, 'Plain' Pottery, Cypriot Pottery, Inscribed Bowl, Dog Bones, Stone Fragments, and Other Studies.* Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015. xiii + 288 pp. and 63 plates. Hardcover, SF 142.00/EUR 150.00.

The book under review represents the second and concluding volume of the final report for the well-known salvage excavation of an Iron Age IIA-B *favissa* or cultic repository pit, extremely rich in finds, discovered on a hill just north of Tel Yavneh in Israel. The first volume appeared in 2010 (for a content summary of this earlier report, see my review in *Near East Archaeological Society*

Bulletin 56 [2011]: 44–48), and the authors are to be heartily congratulated for their valiant efforts in excavating this site under very trying circumstances, as well as completing the publication of all of its data. While specialist studies of the corpus of finds comprise a few chapters of the volume, the bulk of the report is historical and contextual studies of the finds, and is surprisingly engaging, as well as informative reading. Kletter provides a brief account of the excavation in the introduction (X–XI), which includes helpful information that places the finds in their likely historical and biblical context. An appendix contains the complete daily excavation diary (translated from Hebrew), which is a welcome, albeit rather unusual, addition to a published final report.

Of the eighteen chapters in the volume, seven are devoted to studies of a Kernos, zoomorphic vessels, pottery stands, Cypriot pottery, canine remains, animal representation in the cult stands, and stone objects. The remaining chapters are generally more substantial in length and cover the finds with more historical and biblical significance. The first two chapters describe the Yavneh fire pans, where Kletter and Ziffer provide Iron Age parallels and additional comparisons from other historical periods and sites, notably from the Aegean region during the Late Bronze Period. Of particular interest is their study of fire pans in the Old Testament, which they identify with the Hebrew term *maḥtāh* (e.g., the accounts of Nadab and Abihu in Lev 10 and of Korah in Num 16–17). In chapter four, Kletter presents a detailed study of a clay model shrine as well, including a valuable catalogue of known examples from other sites. The discovery and publication of the Yavneh model shrine is particularly timely for comparisons with other examples recently unearthed at Khirbet Qeiyafa and Khirbat Ataruz in Jordan. The artistic and cultic symbolism on these small models has been linked to a fascinating array of motifs and architectural parallels, such as those found on Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem. Their exact function (Kletter suggests their use as portable shrines), however, remains unclear.

Of special note is Kletter's lengthy discussion of the volute capitals present on selected model shrines. His careful presentation of the evidence and resultant arguments comprise a systematic and devastating critique of fellow Israeli archaeologist Oded Lipschits's recent attempt to equate volute capitals, specifically those unearthed at Ramat Rahel, with Assyrian hegemony during the seventh century BCE (see, e.g., "The Origin and Date of the Volute Capitals from the Levant," in *The Fire Signals of Lachish: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Israel in the Late Bronze Age, Iron Age, and Persian Period in Honor of David Ussishkin,* eds. I. Finkelstein and N. Na'aman [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011], 203–225). These capitals are found throughout the Levant and Cyprus. Nearly identical capitals have been unearthed in Jerusalem and recently at a site in the Rephaim Valley. On the basis of their location, stylistic variations clearly represent distinctive regional and national tastes, but all are clearly based upon earlier Northern Syrian or Phoenician prototypes. Ironically, the petrographic analysis of the Yavneh Model Shrine points to a Phoenician origin. Moreover, the datable contexts for some examples of volute capitals and their representations on

ceramics clearly precede any direct Assyrian involvement in the region. Consequently, suggestions to directly link these capitals to Assyrian imperial policy are simply preposterous. Ironically, this erroneous view did not originate with Lipschits nor apparently with his teacher Nadav Na'aman, but rather at least as early as Baruch Halpern's flawed observation published in 1996 ("Sybil, or the Two Nations? Archaism, Kinship, Alienation, and the Elite Redefinition of Traditional Culture in Judah in the 8th–7th Centuries BCE," in *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-First Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference,* eds. J. S. Cooper and G. M. Schwartz [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns], 304n32), which Lipschits fails to credit in his publication. Thankfully, Kletter's incisive remarks help to clear the air on this issue, offering badly needed correctives for these recent misrepresentations (and cases of outright wishful thinking) relating to the origins of this important architectural motif.

As in the first volume, Nava Panitz-Cohen continues her study of the local pottery (chalices and bowls), enabling her to present a "more comprehensive picture" from a larger qualitative and quantitative analysis. The results and comparisons with other sites, notably the Tell es-Safi/Gath Stratum A3 assemblage, confirm her earlier conclusions that date the Yavneh pottery from the mid-ninth to the early eighth centuries BCE. with closer affinities to the coastal plain than with the Shephelah and Negeb.

A brief chapter by Reinhard G. Lehmann publishes a short Hebrew inscription incised on a bowl. The probable reading is לעזז (belonging to *'uzza*), a name ironically similar to or deriving from the same root as Uzziah, the king of Judah credited with breaching the walls of Yavneh (2 Chr 26:6).

Another very useful study is by Nicole Strassburger, who compiled a list of known *favissae* in Israel-Palestine from the Late Bronze through the Persian period contexts and thus presenting the Yavneh *favissa* in a broader chronological and regional context. Less than a dozen sites with *favissae* were noted, including the recent finds at Moza, and all of them located in Cisjordan.

In the final chapter, Kletter provides a summary of the finds and their significance by discussing the Yavneh *favissa* in the context of regional trade and Philistine ethnicity, as well as artifactual links to finds from Mt. Gerizim, Tel Dan, and Helike.

Like the first volume of this final report, editing and production are first-rate. The extensive plates, including some in color, are sharp and clear, and only a few bibliographic errors were noted.

In summary, *Yavneh II* offers the reader noticeably more than merely a collection of narrowly focused specialist reports. Rather, the volume both reveals and applies the relevance of these primarily cultic finds, identifying several fascinating connections with written sources and providing some important contributions to biblical history, including proposing more precise definitions, if not new understandings for a brace of Hebrew words. Kletter, Ziffer, and Zwickel, as well as each contributor, deserve our heartfelt congratulations.

Bethel College
Mishawaka, Indiana

Jeffrey P. Hudon

Klingbeil, Gerald A. ed. *The Genesis Creation Account and Its Reverberations in the Old Testament*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2015. 408 pp. Softcover, US$24.99.

The Genesis Creation Account and Its Reverberations in the Old Testament, edited by Dr. Gerald A. Klingbeil, research professor of Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern Studies at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in Berrien Springs, MI, is the first volume in a two-volume set dealing with creation. The book looks at the creation theme throughout the Old Testament and shows that the biblical writers understood Gen 1 and 2 as historical fact, with a prominent place in their theology. The second volume will deal with the Genesis account in the New Testament and will be edited by Thomas Shepherd.

The contributors of this volume are from the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Southern Adventist University, and the Biblical Research Institute, notably Richard Davidson, Jacques Doukhan, Randall Younker, Michael Hasel, Ángel Rodriguez, et al. The authors all have PhDs in different fields of Old Testament studies.

The book is divided into three sections: first, *Biblical Cosmology* (with two chapters), second, *Creation Accounts and Creation Theology* (with six chapters), and third, *Creation, Evolution, and Death* (with two chapters). Each chapter deals with a different aspect of these themes. *Creation Accounts and Creation Theology* is the largest section covering the Pentateuch, Psalms, with an extensive discussion of Psalm 104, and the Wisdom and Prophetic literature. The *Biblical Cosmology* section deals with the term *rāqîa* (often translated as *firmament* or *expanse* in reference to the sky) and what the ancients believed about the universe. The *Creation, Evolution, and Death* section discusses the possibility of death before the fall and ancient evolutionary ideas.

The book takes the position that the Old Testament supports a literal interpretation of Gen 1 and 2 and that creation happened over a literal week of seven days in the last six to ten thousand years.

The book is a solid, well-documented work. There are ample footnotes and the subject matter of each chapter covers a broad range of topics within the creation controversy. The book does not go into great detail on each topic, but it gives a good overview of some of the major issues involved in the creation debate, such as the *rāqîa* or solid-dome debate, possible evolutionary ideas from antiquity, and whether or not there was death before the fall of Adam and Eve.

My interests lie where the scientific and theological realms meet. Because of this, I found the *Biblical Cosmology* and the *Creation, Evolution, and Death* sections the most intriguing. The discussion of the history of the three-tiered universe modal was quite enlightening. Most people think the ancients believed in a solid, metal-like dome, a flat earth, and an underworld; but, as Drs. Gerhard and Michael Hasel relate, this concept was of pagan origin. It was only recently, through the influence of Voltaire and a few others, that the idea was transferred to the biblical story.

The discussion of the term *rāqîa* by Drs. Randall Younker and Richard Davidson was well written and very helpful. This term, describing the

firmament or sky, has not been clearly understood by many. However, Younker and Davidson suggest that the term simply means expanse or sky, similar to how we understand what the sky is today.

As mentioned, the book covered many topics relating to the creation debate, but, for me, it could have included a few more topics. One topic to add would be a study of creation in the book of Job. Many scholars (see, e.g., Ronald Osborn's *Death Before the Fall*) think that Job has much to say about creation. A chapter on this would have been helpful.

This book is a great resource for anyone who wants to know more about what the Bible says in regard to creation. The chapters are well written and easy to follow and understand. The writers present a solid case for a literal interpretation of Gen 1 and 2 in Old Testament theology. They support their positions well. Many people resort to attacking those with whom they do not agree, but the authors of this volume eschew such tactics, and I greatly appreciate this. Background knowledge of the various topics is helpful, but not absolutely necessary, making *The Genesis Creation Account* accessible to the well-informed lay reader. This is a book that should be in one's library. For a detailed discussion of these topics, another book would be a better choice, but for an overview of how Genesis fits into Old Testament theology, *The Genesis Creation Account* is a must read.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Ryan Brousson

LaCocque, André. *Jesus the Central Jew: His Times and His People*. ECL 15. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2015, 350 pp. Hardcover, US$57.95; Softcover, US$42.95.

My friend André LaCocque has surprised us with a new book, which will inform, enrich, deepen, sometimes shock, and paradoxically draw us closer to our Master and Lord Jesus. Indeed, LaCocque portrays a "human" Jesus who may betray anxiety and uncertainty (195), a Jesus we can relate with, and who is not a far and crushing superhuman Being (277). LaCocque's ambition in this book is to demythologize the Jesus of Christian tradition in order to reveal the Jesus who was "central" to his people and not "marginal," a hint in passing to John Meier's massive trilogy. LaCocque warns, however, that his study is not intended to be a polemic regarding Meier's work (2), which he often refers to and gratefully uses. Although LaCocque does not dismiss the sharp scalpel of the critical methods, he respectfully remains "conservative in dealing with the Gospel text" (5).

LaCocque chose to focus on the Synoptic Gospels, rather than on other New Testament books which, according to LaCocque, introduce "vertical" speculations promoting a super Jesus Christ that is beyond the historical domain (13). Cogently, he digs into the immense funds of Jewish tradition, referring either to rabbinic sources to shed light on the event in view, or even to later literary inspirations ("at the risk of being anachronistic") to trace the hidden and living genius of the testimony. The result is a "historical Jesus"

firmament or sky, has not been clearly understood by many. However, Younker and Davidson suggest that the term simply means expanse or sky, similar to how we understand what the sky is today.

As mentioned, the book covered many topics relating to the creation debate, but, for me, it could have included a few more topics. One topic to add would be a study of creation in the book of Job. Many scholars (see, e.g., Ronald Osborn's *Death Before the Fall*) think that Job has much to say about creation. A chapter on this would have been helpful.

This book is a great resource for anyone who wants to know more about what the Bible says in regard to creation. The chapters are well written and easy to follow and understand. The writers present a solid case for a literal interpretation of Gen 1 and 2 in Old Testament theology. They support their positions well. Many people resort to attacking those with whom they do not agree, but the authors of this volume eschew such tactics, and I greatly appreciate this. Background knowledge of the various topics is helpful, but not absolutely necessary, making *The Genesis Creation Account* accessible to the well-informed lay reader. This is a book that should be in one's library. For a detailed discussion of these topics, another book would be a better choice, but for an overview of how Genesis fits into Old Testament theology, *The Genesis Creation Account* is a must read.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Ryan Brousson

LaCocque, André. *Jesus the Central Jew: His Times and His People*. ECL 15. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2015, 350 pp. Hardcover, US$57.95; Softcover, US$42.95.

My friend André LaCocque has surprised us with a new book, which will inform, enrich, deepen, sometimes shock, and paradoxically draw us closer to our Master and Lord Jesus. Indeed, LaCocque portrays a "human" Jesus who may betray anxiety and uncertainty (195), a Jesus we can relate with, and who is not a far and crushing superhuman Being (277). LaCocque's ambition in this book is to demythologize the Jesus of Christian tradition in order to reveal the Jesus who was "central" to his people and not "marginal," a hint in passing to John Meier's massive trilogy. LaCocque warns, however, that his study is not intended to be a polemic regarding Meier's work (2), which he often refers to and gratefully uses. Although LaCocque does not dismiss the sharp scalpel of the critical methods, he respectfully remains "conservative in dealing with the Gospel text" (5).

LaCocque chose to focus on the Synoptic Gospels, rather than on other New Testament books which, according to LaCocque, introduce "vertical" speculations promoting a super Jesus Christ that is beyond the historical domain (13). Cogently, he digs into the immense funds of Jewish tradition, referring either to rabbinic sources to shed light on the event in view, or even to later literary inspirations ("at the risk of being anachronistic") to trace the hidden and living genius of the testimony. The result is a "historical Jesus"

whose vocation was to be, as Martin Buber put it, "'the appointed human center' of the kingdom of God" (10).

The book moves "step by step" into the life of Jesus, from the moment he confronts his compatriots' messianic expectations (chs. 2–4) to the time of his death and resurrection (chs. 12–14). LaCocque explores all the facets of the personality of Jesus with minutiae and rigor, but also with creativity and literary sensitivity: the Jesus as healer (ch. 4), the Jesus as second Moses and "prophet" (189) who fulfils the Torah (chs. 5–6), the Jesus who "shares flesh and blood with his people" (5; ch. 7); and yet the Jesus who transcends his time and struggles with his self-consciousness (chs. 8, 11). The book is punctuated with discussions on the challenging otherness of Jesus; the stories of his birth, which, according to LaCocque, were not intended to be taken literally (ch. 9), the paradox of his baptism of repentance (ch. 10), and the unusual authority of his teaching, which is rooted in himself rather than in traditional sources (21). Significantly, two chapters are set apart to discuss the meaning of Jesus' statements *ego eimi* "I am," and the last cry of Jesus on the cross *'eli 'eli lamah shabaqtani* "My God, my God why have you forsaken me?" In both cases, LaCocque suggests that Jesus may have pronounced the name of *YHWH*, the forbidden name of God (239, 249), with whom he mysteriously identifies.

The book does not purport to develop a specific theological thesis about Jesus, but to expose us to the living person of Jesus in his complexity. The ambiguous lessons that are often drawn may disturb some, but at the same time, through that very frustration, they may do justice to the real Jesus. The book contains many precious gems and insightful remarks, along with a mine of information that testifies to Jesus's proximity to the Jewish people. Jesus, like the rabbis, argues on the basis of the *qal wahomer* "a fortiori" (Luke 13:5; 14:5; see [21]). LaCocque refers to intriguing parallels with other charismatic figures, miracle-workers, and rabbis of that time who may have been influenced by Jesus; for instance, Honi the circle-maker who, like Jesus, pronounced the Tetragrammaton and is the only one besides Jesus to have called God by the intimate name Abba "Father" (22).

In LaCocque's enquiry into Jewish tradition, from the Qumran texts and the early rabbinic writings to the later mystical Kabbalah, the same contradictory and paradoxical picture is delineated: humble, prophet, priest, theurgist, reformer, and even divine Creator and Redeemer (26). The way Jesus observes and interprets the Law which, has often been taken as an attack against the Jewish traditional way, is, in fact, "a strictly conservative voice" (151). Even what may appear as a transgression of the Law hides, in fact, a better observance, a principle that resonates in Talmudic wisdom: "The transgression of a precept for serving God is more important than to fulfill it without the same intent" (Naz 23b; see [157]). Likewise, Jesus's lesson about the Sabbath, which has been given to man and not man to the Sabbath, is echoed in rabbinic tradition (Yoma 85b).

The discussion on the reason why Jesus spoke in parables is particularly illuminating and original. For LaCocque, this is not just a pedagogical method

to convey a difficult message in a simple and entertaining language. This is essentially a way of engaging the listener in the process of interpretation. The parables, which belong to the *hagadah* genre, are dialogal rather than dogmatic, as is the *halakha* genre; they represent a dynamic revelation rather than a vertical and final word. The listener, as well as the speaker, share the same journey in the seeking of truth. For LaCocque, "There is no Jesus in history in isolation from his interpreters. The historical Jesus is the Jesus interpreted, the Jesus seen by Peter, by the Twelve, by the female followers, then by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John" (177).

One of the main lessons LaCocque draws from this enquiry on the historical Jesus is the failure of the Church to have preserved her Jewish roots, preferring a dogmatic, narrow and "solidified" Jesus rather than the broad and dynamic picture of the Jesus of the Hagaddah (177). According to LaCocque, the birth stories of Jesus were not meant to be taken literally (Greek approach), but they should have been understood in a midrashic sense, to make better room for the hidden face of the Messiah, which paradoxically reveals his "real nature." An example of this paradox is when Jesus urges his disciples to keep the secrecy of his messiaship while he sends them to proclaim the gospel to all Israel (204). Another typical illustration of LaCocque's approach is his treatment of the tension (or the "pendulum") between the particular individual and the collective. While Christians have usually focused on the individual, LaCocque, drawing from the Maharal of Prague, reminds of the importance of the corporate view of messiaship or redemption (204–205).

On the tragic figure of Judas, whose name means "the Jew," LaCocque sadly notes the way traditional Christianity has exploited this figure to fuel the anti-Semitic propaganda and thus contributed to "marginalize" Jesus from his people (213). LaCocque questions the authenticity of the story and suggests a reconstruction on the basis of what he thinks is a Midrash of Zech 11. According to LaCocque, Judas was a Zealot who had good intentions, but things got out of hand.

LaCocque examines the account of the crucifixion, in which he detects many ambiguities, including the one that concerns Jesus's guilt between the Romans and the Jews: "The crowd wants him to die because he is not a Zealot, and the Romans want him to die because he is!" (218). Jesus's evasive answer, "That's what you say" (Matt 26:22–26), contributes to that ambiguity. These ambiguities may well be intentional to raise questions and engage. Even the title "king of the Jews" posted on the cross, which intends to be ironic, is an important affirmation of a profound and messianic truth (it appears six times, 236). The blood of Jesus, which is perceived as an accusation against the Jews, is, in fact, a "subconscious" assertion of a "blood kinship" between the shouting crowd and Jesus (233); what is heard as a curse that condemns could be received as a blessing that atones (234). In other words, what we thought was separating Jesus from his people is, on the contrary, the very place of his connection with them.

Jesus the Central Jew will not leave its reader indifferent. The passionate and engaging style of its author is appealing and driving. The author is well

present behind the lines; LaCocque even interrupts the flow of his writing to refer to a source he just discovered in the midst of his argument (233). Certainly the book and the thesis it carries will raise questions and objections, especially in regard to the issue of incarnation and the divinity of Jesus. The contrast between the Jewish Messiah ascending and the Christian messiah descending (276), which is drawn by Martin Buber and which LaCocque seems to endorse, is not convincing. For Christian tradition knows "messiahs ascending" (see Arianism and the endless "demythologizing" discussions since Bultmann), just as Jewish tradition attests to "messiahs descending" (see some Jewish mystical and rabbinic traditions, and consider Abraham Heschel's reflection about that downwards movement of revelation: "The Bible is not man's theology but God's anthropology" [*Man Is not Alone*, 129]).

Yet, beyond these disagreements which pertain to the technical or theological discussion, vital lessons will hit even on the personal level, just as the one the lawyer learned from Jesus; he had no choice but to cease being preoccupied with himself, "and instead turn toward the suffering of others, all those human beings, Jews and Gentiles whose faces beg, 'do not kill me'" (130). Significantly, LaCocque concludes his book with Martin Buber's *Two Types of Faith* with which he had started. His lament, that was implicit throughout his book, is to deplore that Christianity cut its "moorings with Judaism" and thus "lost its virginity and began an incipient pagan mythological ideology." For LaCocque it is this fault that has delayed the coming of the true kingdom of God (277).

Andrews University Jacques B. Doukhan

Land, Gary. *Historical Dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventists*. 2nd ed., Historical Dictionaries of Religions, Philosophies, and Movements. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015. xxvi + 471 pp. Hardcover, US$116.00.

Gary Land was professor emeritus at Andrews University when he passed away on April 26, 2014. Beginning in 1970, he taught in the Department of History and Political Science at Andrews University and served as chair of this department from 1989 to 2010. Throughout his career he edited and published numerous works relating to Seventh-day Adventist history, including his service as a founding editor of *Adventist Heritage: A Journal of Adventist History*, his edited volume, *Adventism in America: A History* (1986; rev. ed., 1998), and a variety of authored and coauthored works, including *The World of Ellen G. White* (1987) and, with Calvin W. Edwards, *Seeker After Light: A. F. Ballenger, Adventism, and American Christianity* (2000). Most recently, Land completed three final works, including two biographies: *Uriah Smith: Apologist and Biblical Commentator* (2014) and *Ellen Harmon White: American Prophet* (2014), the latter of which he edited with Terrie Dopp Aamodt and Ronald L. Numbers. Land's *Historical Dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventists*, 2nd ed. (2015) was his last published work and is the subject of this review.

present behind the lines; LaCocque even interrupts the flow of his writing to refer to a source he just discovered in the midst of his argument (233). Certainly the book and the thesis it carries will raise questions and objections, especially in regard to the issue of incarnation and the divinity of Jesus. The contrast between the Jewish Messiah ascending and the Christian messiah descending (276), which is drawn by Martin Buber and which LaCocque seems to endorse, is not convincing. For Christian tradition knows "messiahs ascending" (see Arianism and the endless "demythologizing" discussions since Bultmann), just as Jewish tradition attests to "messiahs descending" (see some Jewish mystical and rabbinic traditions, and consider Abraham Heschel's reflection about that downwards movement of revelation: "The Bible is not man's theology but God's anthropology" [*Man Is not Alone*, 129]).

Yet, beyond these disagreements which pertain to the technical or theological discussion, vital lessons will hit even on the personal level, just as the one the lawyer learned from Jesus; he had no choice but to cease being preoccupied with himself, "and instead turn toward the suffering of others, all those human beings, Jews and Gentiles whose faces beg, 'do not kill me'" (130). Significantly, LaCocque concludes his book with Martin Buber's *Two Types of Faith* with which he had started. His lament, that was implicit throughout his book, is to deplore that Christianity cut its "moorings with Judaism" and thus "lost its virginity and began an incipient pagan mythological ideology." For LaCocque it is this fault that has delayed the coming of the true kingdom of God (277).

Andrews University Jacques B. Doukhan

Land, Gary. *Historical Dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventists*. 2nd ed., Historical Dictionaries of Religions, Philosophies, and Movements. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015. xxvi + 471 pp. Hardcover, US$116.00.

Gary Land was professor emeritus at Andrews University when he passed away on April 26, 2014. Beginning in 1970, he taught in the Department of History and Political Science at Andrews University and served as chair of this department from 1989 to 2010. Throughout his career he edited and published numerous works relating to Seventh-day Adventist history, including his service as a founding editor of *Adventist Heritage: A Journal of Adventist History*, his edited volume, *Adventism in America: A History* (1986; rev. ed., 1998), and a variety of authored and coauthored works, including *The World of Ellen G. White* (1987) and, with Calvin W. Edwards, *Seeker After Light: A. F. Ballenger, Adventism, and American Christianity* (2000). Most recently, Land completed three final works, including two biographies: *Uriah Smith: Apologist and Biblical Commentator* (2014) and *Ellen Harmon White: American Prophet* (2014), the latter of which he edited with Terrie Dopp Aamodt and Ronald L. Numbers. Land's *Historical Dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventists*, 2nd ed. (2015) was his last published work and is the subject of this review.

The *Historical Dictionary of Seventh-day Adventists* is laid out in typical dictionary style, with more than 560 entries organized by each letter of the alphabet. There are, however, some additional features, including a brief "Chronology" (or timeline) of Millerite and Seventh-day Adventist history (xxi-xxvi), a short "Introduction" (or overview) of Seventh-day Adventist history (1–9), and a selected "Bibliography" with an accompanying historiographical "Introduction" to the provided source material (381–469). In relation to its first edition, Land's revised *Historical Dictionary* contains about 80 new entries and updated church statistics, as well as a number of corrected mistakes.

Land's broad range of knowledge regarding Seventh-day Adventism enabled him, as the sole author, to produce an impressive dictionary that is written with a non-Adventist audience in mind. It took years of experience and research to produce such a work. Each of the entries is short and to the point, yet very informative. In addition, Land's nine-page overview of Seventh-day Adventist history, which serves as an introduction to the book, is excellently written—a miniature masterpiece. The author truly captured the essence of Adventism and Adventist history in these few pages.

This *Historical Dictionary* is currently the most up-to-date dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, outpacing the denominationally published, multi-authored, two-volume *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, 2nd rev. ed. (1996) by some twenty years. In addition to updated facts, in essentially all of its entries, the *Historical Dictionary* adds many new topics of interest, such as the "Cinema," "Internet," "Sports," or "Politics." Land's work also stands out due to its specific focus on the neglected arts (and artists), with such entries as "Art," "Literature," "Radio," and "Television," or the "Wedgwood Trio," "Jaime Jorge," "Nathan Greene," and the "King's Heralds." The *Historical Dictionary* also includes numerous current figures of importance, such as Ben Carson, George R. Knight, Dwight K. Nelson, and Ted N. C. Wilson. In addition to these contributions, Land incorporated several entries on independent organizations related to Seventh-day Adventism. For example, there are articles on a variety of entities such as "Seventh-day Adventist Kinship International," "Your Story Hour," "Weimar Institute," and the "McKee Foods Corporation."

Though Land's *Historical Dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventists* is an excellent sourcebook, it is virtually impossible for any such work to be without flaws (as Land himself acknowledged [xiii]). Aside from some general mistakes of fact (perhaps typos), there are also some entries that should have been included. In general, the dictionary needs to have a more international focus, especially since the Adventist Church is now predominantly non-American. Also missing are some important educational institutions such as Babcock University, Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, and Canadian University College. In addition, Eric B. Hare certainly deserves an entry, as well as the Generation of Youth for Christ (GYC), the latter of which was not even acknowledged in other related entries, such as "Children and Youth." Perhaps the most surprising omission, however, is the absence of an article on Jesus Christ.

Since Land provided an entry for "God" and the "Holy Spirit," this oversight is stark. Though there is an article on "Christology," it cannot be viewed as an appropriate substitute for an article on Christ himself, since the other two members of the Godhead are included by name.

Since several significant events have occurred in the Adventist Church since the *Historical Dictionary* was published, a revised and updated third edition will be necessary. To name a few examples, the *Adventist Review* has become a monthly periodical (rather than weekly), the Review and Herald Publishing Association has ceased to operate as a printing press, the Institute of Archaeology at Andrews University began excavating an early Christian site in Sicily in 2014 (as well as maintaining its dig in Jordan), Ben Carson has unsuccessfully run for president of the United States, and more than 100,000 people have been baptized in Rwanda after a major evangelistic campaign in 2016. Since Land has passed away, the publisher will need to secure a new author so that the work can be continued.

Though Land's *Historical Dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventists* could be improved in some ways, it is important to stress the significance of this publication. Land has presented Adventism and Adventist history well and has created an important reference tool for interested persons. His perceptive interpretation of people and events stands permanently within Adventist historiography; the *Historical Dictionary* is a credible sourcebook and will remain useful for years to come. Likewise, Rowman & Littlefield is commended for publishing an excellent volume that "will remove some of the mystery" of Seventh-day Adventism through Land's well-informed inside perspective and ability to write "in terms that can be readily understood by outsiders" (xi). In short, Land's *Historical Dictionary* receives my full recommendation.

Tallahassee, Florida Kevin Burton

Laycock, Joseph P. *The Seer of Bayside: Veronica Lueken and the Struggle to Define Catholicism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. xii + 250 pp. Hardcover, US$31.95.

Joseph P. Laycock currently serves as assistant professor of religious studies at Texas State University. He has authored three books, including a novel, titled *Vampires Today: The Truth about Modern Vampirism* (Praeger, 2009), the book treated in the present review, and his most recent book, titled *Dangerous Games: What the Moral Panic over Role-Playing Games Says about Play, Religion, and Imagined Worlds* (University of California Press, 2015). In addition to these works, Laycock has published a number of articles in various academic journals, primarily on subjects that reflect his interest in paranormal activity, Zen Buddhism, or vampirism.

The present work under review, *The Seer of Bayside*, is outlined with seven chapters that chronicle the history of the Baysider movement (a divergent Catholic group that began with a prophetess named Veronica Lueken, in response to Vatican II) up to the present time. The first chapter provides the framework for Laycock's work by building upon Benedict Anderson's

Since Land provided an entry for "God" and the "Holy Spirit," this oversight is stark. Though there is an article on "Christology," it cannot be viewed as an appropriate substitute for an article on Christ himself, since the other two members of the Godhead are included by name.

Since several significant events have occurred in the Adventist Church since the *Historical Dictionary* was published, a revised and updated third edition will be necessary. To name a few examples, the *Adventist Review* has become a monthly periodical (rather than weekly), the Review and Herald Publishing Association has ceased to operate as a printing press, the Institute of Archaeology at Andrews University began excavating an early Christian site in Sicily in 2014 (as well as maintaining its dig in Jordan), Ben Carson has unsuccessfully run for president of the United States, and more than 100,000 people have been baptized in Rwanda after a major evangelistic campaign in 2016. Since Land has passed away, the publisher will need to secure a new author so that the work can be continued.

Though Land's *Historical Dictionary of the Seventh-day Adventists* could be improved in some ways, it is important to stress the significance of this publication. Land has presented Adventism and Adventist history well and has created an important reference tool for interested persons. His perceptive interpretation of people and events stands permanently within Adventist historiography; the *Historical Dictionary* is a credible sourcebook and will remain useful for years to come. Likewise, Rowman & Littlefield is commended for publishing an excellent volume that "will remove some of the mystery" of Seventh-day Adventism through Land's well-informed inside perspective and ability to write "in terms that can be readily understood by outsiders" (xi). In short, Land's *Historical Dictionary* receives my full recommendation.

Tallahassee, Florida Kevin Burton

Laycock, Joseph P. *The Seer of Bayside: Veronica Lueken and the Struggle to Define Catholicism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. xii + 250 pp. Hardcover, US$31.95.

Joseph P. Laycock currently serves as assistant professor of religious studies at Texas State University. He has authored three books, including a novel, titled *Vampires Today: The Truth about Modern Vampirism* (Praeger, 2009), the book treated in the present review, and his most recent book, titled *Dangerous Games: What the Moral Panic over Role-Playing Games Says about Play, Religion, and Imagined Worlds* (University of California Press, 2015). In addition to these works, Laycock has published a number of articles in various academic journals, primarily on subjects that reflect his interest in paranormal activity, Zen Buddhism, or vampirism.

The present work under review, *The Seer of Bayside*, is outlined with seven chapters that chronicle the history of the Baysider movement (a divergent Catholic group that began with a prophetess named Veronica Lueken, in response to Vatican II) up to the present time. The first chapter provides the framework for Laycock's work by building upon Benedict Anderson's

concept of imagined communities. The author uses this premise to argue that the Baysiders are truly part of the imagined (i.e., unseen; not illusory or fake) Catholic community, despite certain tensions that remain with the established hierarchy. This chapter also outlines the significance of the "technologies of power" used by groups devoted to Marian apparitions; namely, the significance of sacred space and sound. Finally, Laycock provides information about his methodology, which involved ethnographic research as well as archival work.

Chapter 2 is devoted to Veronica Lueken, her first visions, and her new role as a Marian oracle. By comparison, Laycock also includes a significant amount of information about a forerunner to Lueken: Mary Ann Van Hoof. The third chapter discusses the "Battle of Bayside," which was a contest fought over the sacred space surrounding the St. Robert Bellarmine Roman Catholic Church in Bayside, New York. Chapter 4 addresses how the Baysider movement formally organized after it was forced to relocate to Flushing Meadows and the liturgy and vigils that developed as a result. This is followed by an examination of the spread of Baysider beliefs around the globe, along with the Catholic Church's reactions to this reality. The sixth chapter records events in the Baysider movement after the death of its prophet and seer, Veronica Lueken, in 1995 and concludes with some speculations about the possible outcomes of this divergent group. The final chapter wraps up with an exploration of what Laycock calls the "dance of deference and defiance"; that is, the colored relationship the Baysider movement has shared with the Catholic hierarchy regarding things that they have received and rejected from institutional leaders.

Laycock has done a fantastic job in crafting this book. It is well researched and will remain an important contribution to the study of religion generally and the study of prophetic religious communities in particular. Since the author used ethnographical and historical methodologies to conduct his study, a balanced perspective of the Baysider movement is presented with a refreshing blend of past and present perspectives. Laycock is to be commended for his objectivity and fair treatment regarding this controversial group.

Though this work is certainly recommended, it seems that *The Seer of Bayside* could have been improved in a couple of ways. First, the title of the book is somewhat misleading. When I first saw the book I assumed that it was a biography of Veronica Lueken. As I began to read, I quickly realized that this book was actually about the history of the Baysider movement, which began with Lueken in the 1960s. As this is the case, it would have been nice if the title reflected that reality more clearly. Perhaps something like "The Seer of Bayside: Veronica Lueken and the History of the Baysider Movement" would have been more appropriate. Nevertheless, this issue does not detract from the importance of Laycock's contribution; it is merely a fleeting distraction.

Second, the author has not acknowledged Veronica Lueken's use of the Bible in her prophecies. Numerous allusions to Scripture are found within the limited selection of statements cited in Laycock's work. Of these, the author only acknowledged the *possibility* that Lueken may have referenced Rev 8:13 when she saw a black eagle in the sky that said, "Woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth" (33; cf. 3); but this was done in an endnote and

disregarded because "Baysider literature makes no mention of this connection" (204). Even if Baysiders themselves have not noticed allusions to the Bible in Lueken's oracles, it is certainly evident that they exist. Lueken referenced Jonah 3:10; 4:11 incorrectly by claiming that God destroyed Nineveh, which was given alongside a remark of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen 19:23–29 (88). She alluded to Rev 9:1–11 with a reference to demons and the open abyss (102). Lueken also adverted to Rev 2:9 and 3:9 with a comment about the "synagogue of Satan" (113). It also seems likely that Lueken's visions that commanded the silence of women in churches and the donning of female head coverings were influence by her understanding of 1 Cor 11:1–16; 14:34–35; and 1 Tim 2:9–12 (34, 124, 168).

Though some may consider it unnecessary to acknowledge scriptural allusions like this, it seems quite beneficial if we are to understand Lueken and her message. For example, Lueken claimed that Mary told her that she would have "to face the red serpent." Rather than unpack this allusion to Rev 12 (specifically, vv. 3, 9, and 14), Laycock simply suggests, "The phrase 'red serpent' indicated that Lueken was not only confronting demonic forces, but communist ones as well" (91). Though possibly a covert reference to communism, it seems more likely that Lueken was placing herself in the position of the woman in Rev 12 that fled from the red serpent's face. This reading is more plausible, because Roman Catholics, such as Lueken, typically interpret this woman to be Mary, the mother of Jesus, because the woman also gave birth to a son that would rule all the nations (cf. Rev 12:4–5). Therefore, it seems that Lueken essentially identified herself with the Virgin Mary—the one supposedly talking with her—and her struggle with Satan, the red serpent. At best, Lueken could have meant her statement about the red serpent to be understood as a *double entendre* for communism and Satan, but the latter reading seems more overt.

Regardless of these two critiques, *The Seer of Bayside* is a foundational study of this new religious group, as it is the first objective work on Veronica Lueken and the Baysider movement. Laycock's insights as a Roman Catholic scholar enabled him to wade through many references to Catholic liturgies and practices that non-Catholics would have easily missed. Furthermore, he was able to illustrate many of the commonalities that Marian apparition movements around the globe share with one another. These features, as well as many others not mentioned in this review, make *The Seer of Bayside* a valuable resource for scholars and proletarians alike.

Tallahassee, Florida Kevin Burton

MacLeod, David J., *The Suffering Servant of the Lord: A Prophecy of Jesus Christ*. Dubuque, IA: Emmaus Bible College, 2016. ix+224. Softcover, US$19.95.

A native of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, Canada, David J. MacLeod is presently a professor of Bible and Theology at Emmaus Bible College in Dubuque, Iowa, where he has taught since 1983. He served as associate editor of *The*

disregarded because "Baysider literature makes no mention of this connection" (204). Even if Baysiders themselves have not noticed allusions to the Bible in Lueken's oracles, it is certainly evident that they exist. Lueken referenced Jonah 3:10; 4:11 incorrectly by claiming that God destroyed Nineveh, which was given alongside a remark of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen 19:23–29 (88). She alluded to Rev 9:1–11 with a reference to demons and the open abyss (102). Lueken also adverted to Rev 2:9 and 3:9 with a comment about the "synagogue of Satan" (113). It also seems likely that Lueken's visions that commanded the silence of women in churches and the donning of female head coverings were influence by her understanding of 1 Cor 11:1–16; 14:34–35; and 1 Tim 2:9–12 (34, 124, 168).

Though some may consider it unnecessary to acknowledge scriptural allusions like this, it seems quite beneficial if we are to understand Lueken and her message. For example, Lueken claimed that Mary told her that she would have "to face the red serpent." Rather than unpack this allusion to Rev 12 (specifically, vv. 3, 9, and 14), Laycock simply suggests, "The phrase 'red serpent' indicated that Lueken was not only confronting demonic forces, but communist ones as well" (91). Though possibly a covert reference to communism, it seems more likely that Lueken was placing herself in the position of the woman in Rev 12 that fled from the red serpent's face. This reading is more plausible, because Roman Catholics, such as Lueken, typically interpret this woman to be Mary, the mother of Jesus, because the woman also gave birth to a son that would rule all the nations (cf. Rev 12:4–5). Therefore, it seems that Lueken essentially identified herself with the Virgin Mary—the one supposedly talking with her—and her struggle with Satan, the red serpent. At best, Lueken could have meant her statement about the red serpent to be understood as a *double entendre* for communism and Satan, but the latter reading seems more overt.

Regardless of these two critiques, *The Seer of Bayside* is a foundational study of this new religious group, as it is the first objective work on Veronica Lueken and the Baysider movement. Laycock's insights as a Roman Catholic scholar enabled him to wade through many references to Catholic liturgies and practices that non-Catholics would have easily missed. Furthermore, he was able to illustrate many of the commonalities that Marian apparition movements around the globe share with one another. These features, as well as many others not mentioned in this review, make *The Seer of Bayside* a valuable resource for scholars and proletarians alike.

Tallahassee, Florida Kevin Burton

MacLeod, David J., *The Suffering Servant of the Lord: A Prophecy of Jesus Christ*. Dubuque, IA: Emmaus Bible College, 2016. ix+224. Softcover, US$19.95.

A native of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, Canada, David J. MacLeod is presently a professor of Bible and Theology at Emmaus Bible College in Dubuque, Iowa, where he has taught since 1983. He served as associate editor of *The*

Emmaus Journal, a semiannual journal of biblical and theological studies, and has written articles in *The Emmaus Journal*, *Journey Magazine*, and *Bibliotheca Sacra*. MacLeod has also authored two other books: *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (1998) and *The Seven Last Things* (2003).

The Suffering Servant of the Lord: A Prophecy of Jesus Christ originated from expository sermons that MacLeod delivered at an annual men's conference in Ontario, Canada, in 2011. Subsequently, he presented these lectures/sermons at three other conferences and four congregations until the present monograph was developed. Hence, MacLeod composed his present book over the last five years as he expanded and perfected his manuscript. The author's methodological approach is not explicitly stated. However, a review of the manuscript makes it clear that MacLeod uses an exegetical and biblical study approach. Although the author does not share specifically why he wrote this monograph, it appears to be for the simple reason that Isa 52:13–53:12 contains a prophetic message pointing to Jesus (see xi).

The Suffering Servant of the Lord is divided into five chapters followed by five appendices. The fact that the book is separated into five chapters demonstrates that the author is following the traditional structure of the fourth servant song: five stanzas with each stanza comprised of three verses. The first chapter begins by introducing Isa 52:13–53:12 as well as the book of Isaiah as a whole. MacLeod then outlines the history of how commentators have used the book of Isaiah over the years. The setting of the passage follows, giving the structure of the book, date, and authorship. Next, the literary genre and history of the fourth servant song are briefly discussed. The author then gives an overview of interpretations regarding the subject of the passage, specifically the identity of the servant, which appears somewhat premature for the first chapter (see 11–18). Finally, MacLeod provides an exposition of the first stanza in Isa 52:13–15. Each verse is approached exegetically. Linguistic and contextual analysis is used for the entire servant song, and each of the next four stanzas is considered using the same method.

Employing one chapter for each stanza, MacLeod links his exegetical structure in these stanzas to previous scholars who have suggested a structural division for the servant song. Thus, in chapter two, the author exposits the next set of verses, Isa 53:1–3, with each following chapter moving to the next three verses: chapter three, vv. 4–6; chapter four, vv. 7–9; and chapter five, vv. 10–12. The author obviously sees that these sets of verses are related to particular aspects of Jesus' last moments on earth. The titles of each chapter suffice here to show the author's theological conceptions: "From Golgotha to God's Right Hand," Isa 52:13–15; "Israel's Rejection of the Servant of the Lord," Isa 53:1–3; "The Vicarious Sufferings of the Servant of the Lord," Isa 53:4–6; "The Ignominious yet Voluntary Death of the Servant of the Lord," Isa 53:7–9; and "The Resurrection and Reward of the Servant of the Lord," Isa 53:10–12.

What drives MacLeod's exegesis of each chapter is his theology, as demonstrated by the titles of each chapter, since MacLeod presupposes that the fourth servant song refers directly to Jesus. While it is true that Isaiah 52:13–53:12 points to someone who would come to fill the attributes outlined

in this passage, Isaiah's audience may have understood the message to refer to someone more in their time rather than to someone who would come in the distant future. Since MacLeod assumes the servant to be Jesus, he does not discuss to whom Isaiah may have referred or how the audience may have understood Isaiah's message. It would have been better, and clearer, if the connection to Jesus had been made toward the end of the book in a chapter dedicated to demonstrating how the servant song and Jesus are associated and how Jesus is predicted. MacLeod has done a great work, particularly in the footnotes, in terms of his linguistic approach, but his work is weakened by the fact that he has not fully developed his use of exegesis.

MacLeod's book also has another strength, the appendices, if readers take time to explore these particular sections on "The Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 in the Jewish Interpreters," "Healing and the Atonement in Isaiah 53," "Popular Objections to the Doctrine of Substitution," "Christian Hymnody and the Doctrine of Substitution," and finally, "A Composer, A Disgraced Actress, A Debtor's Prison, and Isaiah 53." These sections supply plenty of valid and varied information concerning Isa 53. However, some of these appendices would have been more appealing if included in the main text of the book, perhaps as excurses.

MacLeod's book seems to be geared toward two audiences: laypeople would be interested in the major content of the monograph, and scholars would find the rich sources in the footnotes useful and stimulating. The challenge with this approach is that many scholars may not take the time to peruse the book in order to read the footnotes. It may have been better to focus on one audience or the other to really do a good job.

The Suffering Servant of the Lord contains a wealth of information, and it is well documented with plenty of references to research by other scholars. However, while MacLeod supplies much scholarly support for his claims, many of the sources are older, and it would have been nice to see more recent sources and up-to-date information. The greatest weakness of this book is the absence of a bibliography and indexes, which makes it hard for readers to find particular topics, authors, and biblical passages.

Overall, *The Suffering Servant of the Lord* is a great book, in spite of the weaknesses mentioned above. While it is definitely worth reading and would be a helpful source for college students, I would not recommend this book for graduate-level scholarship. This book's theology would be mostly accepted in traditional scholarship circles, although the majority of scholars would not accept its approach and theology.

Pacific Union College Stephane Beaulieu
Angwin, California

Miller, Nicholas P. *The Reformation and the Remnant*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2016. 144 pp. Softcover, US$15.99.

In his debut monograph on *The Religious Roots of the First Amendment* (Oxford University Press, 2012), Nicholas P. Miller, professor of church history in

in this passage, Isaiah's audience may have understood the message to refer to someone more in their time rather than to someone who would come in the distant future. Since MacLeod assumes the servant to be Jesus, he does not discuss to whom Isaiah may have referred or how the audience may have understood Isaiah's message. It would have been better, and clearer, if the connection to Jesus had been made toward the end of the book in a chapter dedicated to demonstrating how the servant song and Jesus are associated and how Jesus is predicted. MacLeod has done a great work, particularly in the footnotes, in terms of his linguistic approach, but his work is weakened by the fact that he has not fully developed his use of exegesis.

MacLeod's book also has another strength, the appendices, if readers take time to explore these particular sections on "The Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 in the Jewish Interpreters," "Healing and the Atonement in Isaiah 53," "Popular Objections to the Doctrine of Substitution," "Christian Hymnody and the Doctrine of Substitution," and finally, "A Composer, A Disgraced Actress, A Debtor's Prison, and Isaiah 53." These sections supply plenty of valid and varied information concerning Isa 53. However, some of these appendices would have been more appealing if included in the main text of the book, perhaps as excurses.

MacLeod's book seems to be geared toward two audiences: laypeople would be interested in the major content of the monograph, and scholars would find the rich sources in the footnotes useful and stimulating. The challenge with this approach is that many scholars may not take the time to peruse the book in order to read the footnotes. It may have been better to focus on one audience or the other to really do a good job.

The Suffering Servant of the Lord contains a wealth of information, and it is well documented with plenty of references to research by other scholars. However, while MacLeod supplies much scholarly support for his claims, many of the sources are older, and it would have been nice to see more recent sources and up-to-date information. The greatest weakness of this book is the absence of a bibliography and indexes, which makes it hard for readers to find particular topics, authors, and biblical passages.

Overall, *The Suffering Servant of the Lord* is a great book, in spite of the weaknesses mentioned above. While it is definitely worth reading and would be a helpful source for college students, I would not recommend this book for graduate-level scholarship. This book's theology would be mostly accepted in traditional scholarship circles, although the majority of scholars would not accept its approach and theology.

Pacific Union College Stephane Beaulieu
Angwin, California

Miller, Nicholas P. *The Reformation and the Remnant*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2016. 144 pp. Softcover, US$15.99.

In his debut monograph on *The Religious Roots of the First Amendment* (Oxford University Press, 2012), Nicholas P. Miller, professor of church history in

the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University, undertook to trace a line from Luther to Madison and, in the minds of many reviewers, succeeded in establishing the idea of God's unmediated claim on the soul's obedience as a seminal force in the history of American disestablishment. Having established the significance of dissenting Protestant theological tradition for sustaining liberty of conscience in the history of Western political thought, Miller issued a call for the spiritual and intellectual descendants of that tradition to bolster the separation of church and state and propagate religious freedom in the twenty-first century United States. Along the way to that conclusion Miller seems to have acquired a broad knowledge of the ideas circulating between sixteenth-century Protestant Europe and eighteenth-century Protestant America, because it is on full display in his second work of historical scholarship, *The Reformation and the Remnant*. Only this time Miller is not on the trail of a single idea but ranges across the terrain of early-modern Protestant thought, searching out the pathways of ideas that appear to have wandered into the constitution of his idiosyncratic faith community. And this time his argument is not a modest one, aimed at the shapers of a fairly narrow range of the public policy of the United States of America; rather, the cumulative effect of his theological conclusions belies an ambition to sway (or shore-up, depending on one's point of view) the thought leadership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church up and down the battle-line between "fundamentalists" and "modernists" within the denomination (15–17).

Miller devotes a chapter each to eleven hot-potato issues—doctrinal (e.g., creation and evolution), social/ethical (e.g., civil rights and same-sex marriage), and spiritual (e.g., Christian perfection)—most of which could fill one or more volumes if explored from every angle. But Miller intends to demonstrate how, by confronting factional biases with the perspectives of the past, his church can bring the borders of its theological expeditions down to a manageable size, focusing on those options more likely to bear fruit. Accordingly, Miller sketches doctrinal maps that define the contours of a middle way between two historically identified extremes for the issues under consideration.

That does not imply that *The Reformation and the Remnant* rushes haphazardly from one point scored against the extremists to the next. Miller carefully unites his historical evaluations of contemporary controversies by enlisting Hugo Grotius's moral government of God theory as a theological touchstone (36). But before moving on to the heart of Miller's project—shining the character of God as a light upon a historical path darkened by extremism—some brief comments about style and presentation are in order.

The Reformation and the Remnant is published by a denominational publishing house and is pitched to an audience of pastors, church administrators, and interested lay-people. Each chapter is followed by discussion questions that lend themselves to small group or classroom settings. The prose is fluid and accessible, but the academic reader may at times wish for a more thoroughgoing approach to the notes. That is not to say that Miller's work here is of no scholarly interest. For example, he has identified in the work of a seventeenth-century Seventh Day Baptist what is likely the

earliest antecedent to the Adventist prediction of "a final conflict that he terms the 'last great controversy'" over the status of the seventh-day Sabbath (110).

Unfortunately, Miller's contributions are at times not well served by what seems to this reviewer to be a slipping editorial standard in Adventist publishing. Do the economic realities of book sales mean that personal responsibility for proofreading is the price an academic seeking a readership within his confessional community must pay for that access? Perhaps so, and perhaps the occasional subject-verb disagreement is more readily passed over by an audience used to reading hastily produced blog and social media content.

Returning to questions of a more enduring character, to justify the selection of the particular screen through which he sifts the historical chaff without losing the wheat, Miller relies on an economy of salvation, God's moral government of love, in which God welcomes questions about his conduct and answers them on the basis of evidence. This is so because God must play by his own rules, that is, those unchanging principles that derive from his character and govern his creation for mutual well-being. God desires our well-being, because he is love and therefore wills that we freely choose to love him and express our love by living according to his principles (40). Thus, in Adventist cosmic-conflict theology, free-willed beings can have their questions about God answered by comparing the evidence of his conduct in human affairs to the principles of his law (141), and God's judgment ultimately becomes his demonstration that his conduct throughout the whole of salvation history is consistent with his law.

Miller grounds this theology in a historical strain going back to Arminius's free-will Reformed theology and given its first full expression in the work of the Arminian Remonstrant, Hugo Grotius. Grotius's views on the moral government of God found their way into Milton's *Paradise Lost* and thence to Wesley and on to America in the New Haven school of Finney and Barns, all of whom influenced the Adventist visionary, Ellen White. For Miller, speaking to his coreligionists, this history of "a venerable, core Protestant theme" amounts to a theological tradition within which Adventist cosmic conflict theology (i.e., the great controversy theme) can be defended historically against the critique that it emerges solely from the visions of Ellen White (50).

It seems that Miller, without saying as much, has taken two reference points for divine judgment, law and evidence, as necessary for the moral government of God to function not only in judgment but also in the economy of salvation more generally, including as it relates to Christian practice and theology. It is the exclusion of one or the other that defines the extremes in Miller's approach to history, and the synthesis of both that comes to define his middle way. For example, the moral government of God is a middle way that unites the role of law and evidence and eschews two extremes. One extreme denies God's inherent offense at sin, which arises out of his law; the other, that God's justice can make sense to humans on the basis of available evidence (41).

Thus, broadly conceived, the pole of the law allows the church to maintain structure, order, and healthy boundaries. But when Christians who uphold the law are polarized away from the role of evidence, the result is legalism,

rigidity, and inflexibility. For Miller, this is the error of "fundamentalism," foundationalism, "creedalism" (61), and is historically associated with an exclusive focus on special revelation ("*solo scriptura* . . . the Bible as the *only* source of religious knowledge" [22]).

The other pole, centered on the evidence of God's activity in the course of human affairs, makes calls for reform, spiritual growth, and theological correction possible by necessitating the toleration of differences. This evidence is drawn from the realm of general revelation, but conclusions based on it must be ruled by the Bible as "a norming norm" (24). Miller doesn't explain exactly how "the superiority of the biblical source" is maintained in theological interpretation, but when Christians who focus on extrabiblical evidence allow it to supersede the revelation of Scripture, libertinism, "experientialism" (18), and relativism are sure to follow.

In this reading of Miller, the middle way not only avoids extremes that rend the moral government of God apart, but also finds deeper synthesis of the roles of law and evidence that the extremes neglect. His goal is to arrive at a pragmatic certainty of "truth," "based both on the ideas of Scripture and the experiences of the individual" (18; and, he might add, reason and history [26]). The ultimate aim of this pragmatic certainty is not so much the perfection of a theological system as an ecclesiastical consensus on the distinction between questions that are not "important to defining the community of belief" and those "boundaries defined by Scripture as vital to the identity of the Christian and the church" so that we both "extend Christian tolerance and charity to those who differ from us on issues that are secondary and peripheral" and "hold one another accountable for our violations" of those boundaries (140). But is this approach to history up to the task of defining a heritage to which we must hold true and resolving Adventism's identity crisis in the global north?

Those Adventists who find themselves outside Miller's boundaries will ask whether the edges of these concepts are sharp enough to divide church history into three neat pieces—an extreme, the middle way, and another extreme—along all these issues. Or has a cutting-mold done the real work, and only afterward did Miller draw blunt knives across the scored surface, thinking they had made the cuts? To speak plainly, the middle way he presents, through all its twists and turns, hews uncannily close to positions currently in vogue at Miller's own seminary. What are the chances that Miller, having delved deeply into the currents of the past, would resurface in roughly the same location he and many of his colleagues have dropped anchor? Extremes and moderations are profoundly subjective. I have attempted to reconstruct Miller's implicit method in *The Reformation and the Remnant* in order to highlight that nowhere does it undertake an explicit discussion of whether the moral government of God can have sufficient hermeneutical controls to take Miller's historical judgments out of his beholding eye.

Though I am sympathetic with Miller's conclusions and hopeful for his method, this project, while rhetorically compelling to Andrews-trained pastors and church administrators, awaits theoretical justification. If hermeneutical controls for evaluating history based on God's moral government can be

drawn from the evidence of history and also from the principles of God's Word, his historical evaluations could be made more persuasive to those who are now likely to be skeptical.

Should Miller choose to leave that task to others, answering questions of a more personal nature might ameliorate the appearance that his historical project is captive to his own historical contingency. Has his research caused him to change his mind on any controversial issue? Are there any historically identified areas where his institution needs to grow in its understanding or relinquish extreme views? Has he confronted his own biases against those of history, and how did they fare? How has a study of history persuaded him personally to back away from extremes (Miller comes close to this kind of admission on page 19)?

While theoretically incomplete, Miller's historical-theological project holds significant promise. For too long, Adventist theology at the popular level has drawn meaning almost entirely out of the movement's discontinuities with the majority of church history. *The Reformation and the Remnant* is a fresh and welcome contribution that popularizes a serious attempt to find meaning in Adventism's continuities with its antecedents. This is critical not only for telling the story truthfully, for embracing the contributions of Protestantism, and for refining the movement's sense of identity, but also for opening new possibilities for the Adventist tradition to contribute to a wider stream of Christianity. In all these, Miller is to be commended for putting his expertise at the service of his faith community. *The Reformation and the Remnant* is a book that the polarized factions of his church cannot afford to ignore.

Berrien Springs, MI David J. Hamstra

Miller, Nicholas P. *The Reformation and the Remnant*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2016. 144 pp. Softcover, US$15.99.

In his recent book, *The Reformation and the Remnant*, my former student Nicholas Miller explores Protestant historical and theological themes from an avowedly Arminian, free-will viewpoint. As someone from a more Reformed, Calvinist tradition, I have found it interesting to see where there is agreement, and where there might be some differences in our outlook.

In my view, Miller's account of *sola scriptura*, *prima scriptura*, and *tota scriptura* captured quite well what most Reformers were after as they sought to raise the authority of the Bible over against what had become degenerate traditions. In that same context, his description of Adventist leader and claimed visionary Ellen White's authority as *prima traditionis* is a helpful way of putting the authority of someone regarded as more than ordinarily human but less than fully scriptural. (From my angle, quite a few in the main Protestant traditions do, in fact, treat figures like Martin Luther or John Calvin as *prima traditionis*, even though the formal theologies of these groups do not really have a category like that).

I also thought his distinction between "governmental" and "moral influence" views of the atonement was quite helpful. Again, from my angle I

drawn from the evidence of history and also from the principles of God's Word, his historical evaluations could be made more persuasive to those who are now likely to be skeptical.

Should Miller choose to leave that task to others, answering questions of a more personal nature might ameliorate the appearance that his historical project is captive to his own historical contingency. Has his research caused him to change his mind on any controversial issue? Are there any historically identified areas where his institution needs to grow in its understanding or relinquish extreme views? Has he confronted his own biases against those of history, and how did they fare? How has a study of history persuaded him personally to back away from extremes (Miller comes close to this kind of admission on page 19)?

While theoretically incomplete, Miller's historical-theological project holds significant promise. For too long, Adventist theology at the popular level has drawn meaning almost entirely out of the movement's discontinuities with the majority of church history. *The Reformation and the Remnant* is a fresh and welcome contribution that popularizes a serious attempt to find meaning in Adventism's continuities with its antecedents. This is critical not only for telling the story truthfully, for embracing the contributions of Protestantism, and for refining the movement's sense of identity, but also for opening new possibilities for the Adventist tradition to contribute to a wider stream of Christianity. In all these, Miller is to be commended for putting his expertise at the service of his faith community. *The Reformation and the Remnant* is a book that the polarized factions of his church cannot afford to ignore.

Berrien Springs, MI David J. Hamstra

Miller, Nicholas P. *The Reformation and the Remnant*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2016. 144 pp. Softcover, US$15.99.

In his recent book, *The Reformation and the Remnant*, my former student Nicholas Miller explores Protestant historical and theological themes from an avowedly Arminian, free-will viewpoint. As someone from a more Reformed, Calvinist tradition, I have found it interesting to see where there is agreement, and where there might be some differences in our outlook.

In my view, Miller's account of *sola scriptura*, *prima scriptura*, and *tota scriptura* captured quite well what most Reformers were after as they sought to raise the authority of the Bible over against what had become degenerate traditions. In that same context, his description of Adventist leader and claimed visionary Ellen White's authority as *prima traditionis* is a helpful way of putting the authority of someone regarded as more than ordinarily human but less than fully scriptural. (From my angle, quite a few in the main Protestant traditions do, in fact, treat figures like Martin Luther or John Calvin as *prima traditionis*, even though the formal theologies of these groups do not really have a category like that).

I also thought his distinction between "governmental" and "moral influence" views of the atonement was quite helpful. Again, from my angle I

would say that if humans could specify one "correct" view of the atonement, it would have to draw on all the major theories (maybe even including "moral influence" that I find the least satisfying: "Jesus was nice, you should be too"), with then the real discussion focusing on how the various theories might be amalgamated and under what proportions, etc. His explication of possible Adventist reactions to *Obergefell* also has been helpful—even practically, since I ended a course last term, "Religion and American Politics," by going through important Supreme Court decisions on religion and public life, and probably ending with *Obergefell*.

Of particularly Adventist issues, I was glad to have Miller set out standard Adventist teachings in relationship to Reformation teachings, some of which Adventist matters I'd read about before, but not all. I was intrigued to find out that Frank Hugh Foster had been a translator of Grotius, since I had known Foster mostly for his genetic history of Calvinism—still, in my mind, a really good historical account of early New England theology, though also one that too easily takes standard moral conventions of the late nineteenth century as the bar against which to judge Edwards and his students (I find Foster's judgments about, as opposed to his exposition of, these figures woefully inadequate). I thought Miller's explanation of "moral government" theories was done quite well. Although I continue to have serious doubts about the adequacy of "moral government" ideas about God, especially as set out by N. W. Taylor, it should be obvious, even to us nay-sayers, that a theology responsible to Scripture, Christian tradition, and lived present-day experience must include some element of moral choices understood by conventional common sense.

My objection to full-scale "moral government" theories remains that they seem so obviously a reflection of unself-critical conventions about human nature that are almost entirely a product of the modern era (that is, from the second half of the sixteenth century onwards). Folks like myself probably need to give greater credence than we do to modern common-sense reflections about human nature, the character of human sinfulness, the power of human choosing, and the like. But it is also possible that more self-criticism about such modern eurekas might be warranted among those who see "moral government" as answering all or almost all foundational questions about the ordering of the universe.

I do see Miller as trying to be fair to Reformed believers and their beliefs; that effort is certainly appreciated. As someone who stubbornly sticks with at least some form of many traditional Reformed convictions, I'd want to suggest modifications in a few things: for example, on what "Reformed thinkers are most concerned about" (48)—I would say that the threefold offices of Christ (prophet, priest, and king) were just as important as divine sovereignty in itself, but of course with "Christ as king" implying what Miller says concerning divine sovereignty (For instance, in the Heidelberg Catechism, divine sovereignty is prominent, but in terms of "my only comfort in life and in death" being "my faithful lord and savior Jesus Christ").

Similarly, while the focus in the First Great Awakening was certainly on justification, I think you'd have to read a lot of George Whitefield's

sermons (and also a surprising number from Jonathan Edwards) to see them focusing directly on predestination and divine sovereignty (129). Those were background, foundational convictions, to be sure, but they most wanted individuals to see "the divine and supernatural light" (JE) or to experience "the new birth" (Whitefield).

Questions about creation, sin, death, and the fall are too complicated to address quickly, but after years ago reading B. B. Warfield on creation, evolution, divine sovereignty, the proper role of science, etc., my mind has been at ease with the notion that scientific investigations, when carried out with a focus on empirical results, can be a relatively safe pointer to how best to interpret at least some aspects of the Scriptures. The challenge, as Miller puts it quite well at several points in this book, concerns the weight that specific interpretations of early Genesis should be given. The idea that physical death before the fall and the goodness of the creation are incompatible strikes me as an unnecessary conclusion from *tota scriptura*, but I realize that a whole lot more is involved in such discussions than simple questions of one-off biblical interpretations.

I pray that this book will be helpful to Adventists as they deal with the important matters the book takes up. I'm glad Miller is bringing his gifts and insights to the service of his own Adventist fellowship, even as he continues to think about scholarship for the rest of us as well.

Notre Dame University Mark A. Noll
Notre Dame, Indiana

Noll, Mark A. *In the Beginning Was the Word: The Bible in American Public Life, 1492–1783*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. 339 pp. Hardcover, US$29.95.

The following is based on an oral response to a presentation that Dr. Mark A. Noll gave at Andrews University on his book In the Beginning was the Word. *Nicholas Miller, who gave the response, studied for his PhD in American Religious History under Professor Noll's oversight at the University of Notre Dame. Miller's dissertation was on the religious influences on the American Constitution's First Amendment, published as* The Religious Roots of the First Amendment (Oxford, 2012).

With his new book on the Bible in America, Professor Mark Noll has brought us another work of scholarship that affirms the importance of a knowledge of religion, Christianity, and the Bible to a fuller and more complete understanding of American history. *In the Beginning* gives an overview of the impact and role that the Bible had in American public life during its first three hundred years. It is not a review of the role of the Bible generally, but the Bible in relation to the public square and political life and identity.

The publication of this book coincides with Professor Noll's last year of full-time teaching. The academy is now taking stock of his enormous contributions to the shape of both Christian history, and larger American intellectual history over the last four decades. *In the Beginning* provides a good opportunity to consider not only Noll's mature thought on religion

sermons (and also a surprising number from Jonathan Edwards) to see them focusing directly on predestination and divine sovereignty (129). Those were background, foundational convictions, to be sure, but they most wanted individuals to see "the divine and supernatural light" (JE) or to experience "the new birth" (Whitefield).

Questions about creation, sin, death, and the fall are too complicated to address quickly, but after years ago reading B. B. Warfield on creation, evolution, divine sovereignty, the proper role of science, etc., my mind has been at ease with the notion that scientific investigations, when carried out with a focus on empirical results, can be a relatively safe pointer to how best to interpret at least some aspects of the Scriptures. The challenge, as Miller puts it quite well at several points in this book, concerns the weight that specific interpretations of early Genesis should be given. The idea that physical death before the fall and the goodness of the creation are incompatible strikes me as an unnecessary conclusion from *tota scriptura*, but I realize that a whole lot more is involved in such discussions than simple questions of one-off biblical interpretations.

I pray that this book will be helpful to Adventists as they deal with the important matters the book takes up. I'm glad Miller is bringing his gifts and insights to the service of his own Adventist fellowship, even as he continues to think about scholarship for the rest of us as well.

Notre Dame University Mark A. Noll
Notre Dame, Indiana

Noll, Mark A. *In the Beginning Was the Word: The Bible in American Public Life, 1492–1783*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. 339 pp. Hardcover, US$29.95.

The following is based on an oral response to a presentation that Dr. Mark A. Noll gave at Andrews University on his book In the Beginning was the Word. *Nicholas Miller, who gave the response, studied for his PhD in American Religious History under Professor Noll's oversight at the University of Notre Dame. Miller's dissertation was on the religious influences on the American Constitution's First Amendment, published as* The Religious Roots of the First Amendment (Oxford, 2012).

With his new book on the Bible in America, Professor Mark Noll has brought us another work of scholarship that affirms the importance of a knowledge of religion, Christianity, and the Bible to a fuller and more complete understanding of American history. *In the Beginning* gives an overview of the impact and role that the Bible had in American public life during its first three hundred years. It is not a review of the role of the Bible generally, but the Bible in relation to the public square and political life and identity.

The publication of this book coincides with Professor Noll's last year of full-time teaching. The academy is now taking stock of his enormous contributions to the shape of both Christian history, and larger American intellectual history over the last four decades. *In the Beginning* provides a good opportunity to consider not only Noll's mature thought on religion

and the Bible in America, but also how he has changed our understanding of American history by placing those elements nearer the center of the story than they had previously been in twentieth-century historiography.

Religion Complexified. In restoring a role for religion in American history, Professor Noll's works have never been simple or simplistic. He has not viewed religion, or Christianity, or even Protestantism as a monolithic force, either for good or for ill. His latest work reinforces the view that Christianity, or even Protestantism, is not just one thing. He reveals that the Bible did not just have one kind of influence or role in American history, but was on different sides of various arguments, and at times, on different sides of the same argument, whether it be revolution or slavery.

Whatever we believe about the divine nature and origins of the Bible, its use and impact in history is a very human endeavor. As Noll reminds us, it all too often can be co-opted for very human ends. This is an important lesson to keep in mind, especially in the middle of a presidential campaign, where we are bombarded with messages about how a "true Christian" would vote.

It is this diversity of the Christian and Protestant in history, however, that raises the question of interpretation of history. A major divide prior to Noll's work and that of his religious historian colleagues, such as George Marsden and Nathan Hatch, was the secular/religious divide. But now that religion is acknowledged to have played central roles in American history, we are faced with the question of what varying interpretations of American history might scholars produce who have somewhat different views of religion.

Reformed vs. Arminian. Professor Noll and I are on the same side of the secular/religious divide. We both agree that a view that integrates religious influences and ideas will make for a better history. But we are on different sides of another kind of divide that made our collaboration on my church-state dissertation a unique and, some would say, somewhat improbable task. Noll comes from the Reformed tradition, which views Jonathan Edwards and the New England Puritans as the examplars of all that is true and good and pure in American religious history (to somewhat overstate the matter).

I come from a church in the Arminian, free-will tradition, that often views the Puritans as kind of embarrassing early cousins who gave religion a bad name by running an intolerant semi-theocracy in colonial America (again, to overstate things). Noll, in turn, views the Second Great Awakening, with its free-will, individualistic, subjectivist turn as the beginnings of the embarrassing descent into what has, in the eyes of some, become the self-made, therapeutic religion of modern America.

I first became aware of Professor Noll's views on this when, in my first year of history graduate work, I read Noll's *America's God.* It jolted me awake, being a superb and alarming challenge for an unsuspecting, self-satisfied Arminian. It argued the case that my religious heritage was actually part of the corruption of "real" American Christianity. (That is to put it too simplistically, of course, but not entirely inaccurately.) It was before Noll was at Notre Dame, and I had no idea I would one day study with him, but I knew that one day I would need to respond to that book.

American Decline. The sub-title of *America's God* is *From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*, and it is not a story of progress and victory. Rather, it is story of descent and declension. The argument runs roughly that once America took the God of the Bible seriously, and all its intellectual currents ran through it, then these biblical currents became mixed with Enlightenment reason, Republican individualism, and Whiggish political ideas. While these elements, Noll accepts, made for a fine political ideology, these same political ideas leaked back into the reading of the Bible. Thus, many Americans made a God in the image of a republican, democratic leader, one who respected individual freedom, removed traditional religious authority, and allowed for the proliferation of American sects and denominations, with no hope for an agreed-upon religious basis.

This led, in Noll's telling, to an eventual crisis of moral authority in terms of the Civil War, which he details in a separate book, *Civil War as Theological Crisis*. Since American Protestantism could no longer adjudicate the public issues that really matter, like slavery, we enter a new phase where secular reason holds sway, and the Bible is sidelined into the private sphere.

The Bible and Decline. Noll's latest book takes up this story, this time telling it from the perspective of the role of the Bible in public life. I think Noll is proposing that this is the story of the Bible combining with other strands of thought to bring about great political and societal change, generally in a good way. But there is a price for this change, and part of the fallout is a change in the way people read Scripture, in a manner that is no longer as faithful to Scripture as previously. Here is a quote that I think makes this point: "As the eighteenth century wore on, more and more colonists elided their Christian convictions with political principles intensely distrustful of any top-down exercise of authority, including the authority of inherited religious establishments" (289). The word "elided" is particularly telling. While this verb can mean "combine," it much more often means "replace" or "strike out." Noll's use would suggest the latter meaning, as purer Christian convictions are leavened, changed, and even replaced with various political ideologies.

Reform vs. Radical Bible Reading. Now, in my reading of history, as a biblically conservative Arminian, I would say that these principles in opposition to top-down authority, and the authority of inherited religious establishments, were at their core an impulse of dissenting Protestantism, based on certain biblical teachings, especially the priesthood of believers. Luther and Calvin had flirted with these teachings early on, but moved away from them as they became part of the establishment. But they were championed by the radical reformers, came to England via the English Baptists, and then to America via multiple pathways, including Roger Williams, William Penn, John Milton, and John Locke.

So, in my telling, what is happening in America is that a Reformed reading of the Bible is becoming influenced by and, at times, giving way to a more radical reformation view of reading the Bible. So it is not the Bible being corrupted by secular, enlightenment thought, but the Bible being released from, dare I

say, the shackles of one set of hermeneutical principles, and being subjected to another that has at least an equal (possibly greater?) claim to biblical authenticity.

This difference of view is perhaps illustrated most clearly by our contrasting views of the New England clergyman and politician, Elisha Williams. He wrote a lengthy pamphlet protesting against the requirement that preachers be licensed by the state. It is a key colonial New England document that figures importantly in my earlier book, and I argue is an expression of Protestant dissenting thought, articulated in the language of Lockean political ideas. Locke himself, I argue earlier in the book, is himself influenced by dissenting Protestant political ideas.

Noll views the document somewhat differently. He writes that Williams' pamphlet reflected "first contemporary political convictions, then standard Protestant principles allied with those convictions, and (not inconsequentially, but still third), actual instruction from biblical narratives or precepts. As such," Noll continues, "The Bible remained more conspicuous than for contemporary considerations of economics, race, and slavery, but nonetheless a receding presence."

I would reverse those first two points, at least, and possibly put "contemporary political convictions" as the third. In my reading, Williams' pamphlet is radical not for injecting liberal political opinions into conservative New England, but for injecting dissenting Protestant views into a region historically committed, with the notable exception of Roger Williams, to magisterial views of the Bible and society.

Paine's Common Sense. Now do we have any evidence as to which reading or interpretation is fairer and closer to the evidence? Well, I believe that Noll, being a good historian, provides such evidence in his own work. He invokes Thomas Paine as a user of the Bible in arguing against monarchy. Now both Professor Noll and I know that Paine is not a sincere biblicist, as he goes on to write scathing attacks on the Bible. But in *Common Sense* he is trying to use orthodox Protestant reasoning to reach the Protestant community.

As Noll quotes him, Paine writes that "for monarchy in every instance is the popery of government." Monarchy is the popery of government. Think about this argument. Is it moving from political to religious, or is it the other way around? It's pretty clear that it is from religious to political. Paine is drawing on the widespread Protestant distaste for spiritual hierarchy of popes to argue against the civil hierarchy of kings. To be clear, this spiritual argument is not of Paine's devising, but is held widely by Protestants, but especially by those dissenting Protestants who emphasize the priesthood of all believers and the right of private judgment in matters of religious instruction.

Now, to those Protestant groups that have not held strongly to the priesthood of all believers and the right of private judgment, such as the Puritans and other Reformed believers, this might seem like a political innovation, that is blowing back and changing one's view of the Bible and theology. But that is to view the matter from a Reformed perspective. From a dissenting Protestant view, it seems much more like America's political

experience is causing many people to see more clearly the truths of dissenting Protestantism, and to shift to its reading of the Bible.

American Shift. Indeed, this is the story of American religion over the next half century, as the religious population shifts dramatically from Presbyterian and Congregational, the churches of the Puritans and Pilgrims and the First Great Awakening, to Methodist and Baptist, dissenting groups whose activities and views characterize the Second Great Awakening.

I want to refer to one more Noll quote that acknowledges that the American Revolution is really a contest over ways of reading the Bible: It is "not just that 'religion' factored large in the American Revolution, but that the War of Independence represented the struggle of Scripture incarnate as a weapon of the establishment contesting Scripture incarnate as a Whig weapon" (296).

I think this description of the struggle over Scripture is basically right, but I would paraphrase that with somewhat different terms. I would say it was "Scripture incarnate as magisterial Protestants understood it, including Anglicans and European Reformed thinkers, versus Scripture incarnate as understood by dissenting reformers, including Baptists, Methodists, and even many American Reformed believers."

Now, having said this, I want to ask Professor Noll, if the heart of the American Revolution was differing views of the Bible, why was the Revolutionary War not the war of theological crisis, rather than the American Civil War? Noll argues that the church's failure to solve the problem of slavery as a biblical matter led to the Civil War, and this failure caused the sidelining of the Bible in American public life. But if the Bible had the same "failure" at the American Revolutionary War, why did it not lead to a similar sidelining?

I'm not sure I know the answer to that question; perhaps Noll can give it. But I think it does provide some evidence that the Civil War is not the theological failure, or, at least, not the unique theological failure, that Noll has proposed. Seen through my dissenting Protestant lenses, it seems to me that the Civil War is actually a continued victory for the radical reformation and the moral-government-of-God reading of the Bible. Call it Civil War as theological climax, rather than crisis. Then, I think the post-Civil War biblical decline has to do primarily with an array of other forces, some ideological, including Darwinism and higher criticism coming out of Germany and England, as well as economic, financial, and social pressures.

Why Does It Matter? Let me touch briefly on why this discussion/debate matters beyond a historical interest in the dialogue and debate between Reformed and Arminian lines of thought. Being interested in law and politics, I cannot help but think about our current election, and the issues being contested there. I will blame neither the Reformed nor Arminian traditions for Donald Trump, except perhaps our failure to educate America more thoroughly historically, theologically, and philosophically. But I do think there were other candidates, including Ted Cruz, and our own Ben Carson, who tend to view the "true" religious heritage of America as being in the Christian American views of the New England Puritans.

If the Revolution, the Second Great Awakening, and the results of the Civil War are a "falling away" from our founder's heritage, then notions of the separation of church and state and the religious pluralism, which was set out in principle in the Constitution and then guaranteed at the state level after the Civil War, cannot be viewed as positive historic models that should guide our future. Rather, some would argue, we should return to the "true" heritage of our Puritan pioneers, who combined church and state.

Now, Professor Noll has himself been critical of the "Christian America" thesis, and so I would in no way class him with Cruz or Carson. But his larger argument in this book, and *America's God*, does give a much more sophisticated basis for a Puritan civil outlook as being our true heritage than I am comfortable with. I would view America's true constitutional founding as being in the dissenting Protestant model, and it not being a falling away from biblical truth, but a stepping into an alternate stream of that truth.

America's Protestant Patron Saint. Politics aside, the larger religious historical question may be to answer the question as to who is truly America's Protestant patron saint. Is it Calvin, as mediated to America by the Puritans? Or is it Jacob Arminius, who becomes, in certain ways, the expression of early Luther and the Anabaptists, and is mediated to America by John Wesley and the free-will Baptists?

In honesty, the truth is probably some combination of the two, as my studies with Noll have taught me. Though I would give the edge to Arminius and Wesley, he would give the nod to Calvin, I'm sure (though our experience together has opened my eyes tremendously to Adventism's Calvinist heritage). I hope I have played some small role in convincing him of the role that dissenting Protestant views have played. Ultimately, the two camps are needed to tell the full story, and especially to oppose the secular, liberal story being told on the left side of our political spectrum.

While we argue over whether the true American Revolution and founding was mostly Calvinist or Arminian in nature, there is a whole wing of our country that has decided that the American Revolution was actually the French Revolution. They are determined to remake our country in its image. We both know that is wrong, but that is an argument for another time.

I would like to thank Professor Noll for his important influence on the history profession, on American public life, and on my work in particular. I'm glad we had this chance to exchange views, as I'm afraid it may not continue in heaven. To paraphrase the Calvinist George Whitfield, when he asked if he would see his Arminian theological rival, John Wesley, in heaven: "Mark Noll will be so close to the Throne of Glory, and I will be so far away, I will hardly get a glimpse of him."

And I would add that the line of admirers seeking to speak with him will be so long that by the time I get a chance, the Lord will have already straightened him out on these matters. But no doubt He will have found it necessary to straighten me out first!

Andrews University Nicholas P. Miller

Oden, Thomas C. *A Change of Heart: A Personal and Theological Memoir*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014. 384 pp. Hardcover, US$32.00.

Thomas C. Oden (PhD, Yale University) has been the long-time Henry Anson Buttz Professor of Theology at the Theological School of Drew University in Madison, New Jersey, and currently serves as the general editor of the *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture* and *Ancient Christian Doctrine* series. He is also the author of *Classic Christianity*, a revision of his late 1980's three-volume systematic theology (which is probably the opus of his theological writings). His more recent books include *The African Memory of Mark*, *Early Libyan Christianity*, and *How Africa Shaped the Christian Mind*.

Oden has emerged as one of the major Protestant theological voices of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, and has exerted a marked influence in both international ecumenical and evangelical circles. This personal and theological *Memoir* (autobiography) chronicles his rather remarkable personal, professional, and theological journey. While Oden's personal sojourn has some very fascinating (even heart-warming) autobiographical facets, the substantive importance of this *Memoir* is the chronicling of his striking theological pilgrimage.

Coming from a small-town, mainline Methodist Oklahoma background (he says he grew up with "Oklahoma dust in his nostrils"), Oden would initially, in his career as both pastor and then as a professional academic, deeply immerse himself in what he would characterize as radical "modernity." From the earliest days of his public pilgrimage, he gave evidence of literary and scholarly productivity and would go on to become a classic embodiment of the trendy liberal, even radical, ecumenical campaigner.

But with his move to Drew University there began to emerge a "radical" shift in his thinking to what he would eventually characterize as "Consensual, Classic (or Paleo) Christian Orthodoxy." Put simply, Oden would steadily and progressively begin to reject "Modernity" and its extremely subjective theological and moral presuppositions and replace them with a strong turn to the canons of the great ecumenical councils and writers of the church of the first six centuries. These canons (142–146) have provided Oden with the essential keys to his theological methodology, which will bear the fruit of an alleged "consensual orthodoxy," all inspired by the perspectives of Vincent of Lerins' (fifth century CE) *Aids to Remembering* or the *Commonitory*. At the heart of his adopted "canonical authorities" would be the writers he would call "the Great Eight," the men who were foremost in expressing the creeds and canons of the aforementioned "consensual orthodoxy."

More precisely, Oden's key figures would include "The four great ecumenical Doctors of the Eastern tradition (Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Chrysostom) and the four Doctors of the Church of the West (Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great)." Oden then goes on to make the claim that these "eight" magisterial figures "were the ones most consensually remembered, who most accurately gave expression to the faith that was already well understood by the apostles and celebrated by the

worshipping community under the guidance of the written word." He then adds that "the most moving of those writers, to me, were Athanasius and Augustine. Both of them were refined like gold out of the cauldron of early Christianity in Africa" (144–145).

What is to be made of Oden's methodology and its resultant "consensual orthodoxy"? Most certainly, from the perspective of orthodox Christian thought, there is much to celebrate in these "Paleo" theological contributions to Oden's theology. And here we could at least mention such key items as the Trinity, especially as it was confessed and refined at Nicea, Chalcedon, and Constantinople. And certainly such contributions to the later, more sober, and less trendy Oden have empowered him to make substantive and positive contributions, especially to modern evangelical thought, with its somewhat truncated vision of the longer Christian tradition. But having acknowledged these positive points, one is given sober pause for reflection to wonder if Oden has fully appreciated the major correctives of the sixteenth-century Protestant Reformation and the Arminian contributions that have greatly inspired his own much-beloved eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Methodist heritage.

Furthermore, can we really say that the alleged "consensual orthodoxy" of his "Great Eight" was all that "consensual" and biblically "orthodox"? Possibly the best way to get right to the heart of this allegedly orthodox consensus is to ask Oden how all of this fits in with Augustine's positions on predestination and justification by faith alone. This question becomes quite critical, especially in the light of Oden's own Wesleyan/Arminian background in Methodism. Does Oden's own background in the theology of Wesley count for anything in this discussion? Quite frankly, one senses that the Bible, filtered through the interpretive lenses of Wesley, would be preferable to the lenses provided by Augustine and the rest of Oden's "Great Eight"!

Furthermore, would it be asking too much of Oden to once again take a sympathetic look at the venerable Protestant principle of "the Bible and the Bible alone" as one's ultimate source of theological authority? For instance, can any teacher of justification by faith alone really privilege Augustine when one becomes aware of how much Augustine's theology of justification has informed the Canons on Justification produced by the Council of Trent (not to mention the recent Tridentine-flavored published positions on the issue of justification expressed in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, second edition [revised in accordance with the official Latin text promulgated by Pope John Paul II]; see especially 481ff.)? Quite frankly, it seems that Protestants would do better to once more take their theological cues from canonical Scripture, especially as it has been filtered through the perspectives of Oden's Methodist "father" Wesley (who was more directly a product of the best of the Protestantism of the Puritan and the Anglican "Middle Way" of theology—not Augustine of Hippo and the rest of Oden's "Great Eight"). Certainly Wesley was quite open to the insights of the Early Church Fathers, but they never achieved the kind of "canonical" status that Oden seems to want to cede to these "Fathers of the Church"!

Additionally, when it comes to the practicalities of applying the *sola scriptura* principle, one wonders which writings are easier to understand, the biblical writers or Oden's "Great Eight." Most certainly the writers of the long Christian tradition of theological exposition have made their positive contributions, but would we not be better served to go back to carefully and prayerfully pondering the canonical books of the Bible for our key perspectives in doing theology, especially when it comes to our anthropology, hamartology, and soteriology?

Oden's *Memoir* should be a preferred read for anyone interested in twentieth- and twenty-first-century historical and systematic theology, especially as such work has played out in the halls of modernity, evangelicalism, and ecumenical trends, especially in the context of the unfolding exchanges between Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Evangelical Protestantism.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Woodrow W. Whidden

Porter, Stanley E., and Andrew W. Pitts. *Fundamentals of New Testament Textual Criticism.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015. xvi + 201 pp. Softcover, US$22.00.

According to the authors, this book was produced to fill the need of a midlevel textbook that introduces first- or second-year Greek students to the field of textual criticism and issues related to the canon and translation theories (xiii–xiv). It is the second volume of a series of Greek language resources published by Eerdmans (xi). The first volume, *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek,* was published in 2010 by Stanley E. Porter, Jeffery T. Reed, and Matthew Brook O'Donnell and is composed of a textbook and an accompanying workbook. The third volume, an intermediate grammar, is in the process of being written, and the final volume, a book on exegesis and interpretation, is in the planning stage (xii).

Stanley E. Porter is currently president, dean, and professor of NT at McMaster Divinity College in Hamilton (Ontario). He has authored twenty-eight books, edited ninety volumes, and written over 300 journal articles and chapters in different disciplines of religious studies. He has published several publications in the field of NT textual criticism and actively participates in the current debate by calling scholarship to move away from an eclectic text and accept a single text model. Thus, without any doubt, the author knows the field of NT textual criticism.

Andrew W. Pitts is currently chair of the Biblical Studies Department and assistant professor of Biblical Studies and Christian Ministries at Arizona Christian University. He is the assigned coauthor of the forthcoming intermediate grammar.

Fundamentals Of New Testament Textual Criticism consists of thirteen chapters and an appendix, entitled *Tools for Further Text-Critical Study*. Each chapter ends with a summary, a list of key terminology, and a bibliography. At

Additionally, when it comes to the practicalities of applying the *sola scriptura* principle, one wonders which writings are easier to understand, the biblical writers or Oden's "Great Eight." Most certainly the writers of the long Christian tradition of theological exposition have made their positive contributions, but would we not be better served to go back to carefully and prayerfully pondering the canonical books of the Bible for our key perspectives in doing theology, especially when it comes to our anthropology, hamartology, and soteriology?

Oden's *Memoir* should be a preferred read for anyone interested in twentieth- and twenty-first-century historical and systematic theology, especially as such work has played out in the halls of modernity, evangelicalism, and ecumenical trends, especially in the context of the unfolding exchanges between Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Evangelical Protestantism.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Woodrow W. Whidden

Porter, Stanley E., and Andrew W. Pitts. *Fundamentals of New Testament Textual Criticism.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015. xvi + 201 pp. Softcover, US$22.00.

According to the authors, this book was produced to fill the need of a midlevel textbook that introduces first- or second-year Greek students to the field of textual criticism and issues related to the canon and translation theories (xiii–xiv). It is the second volume of a series of Greek language resources published by Eerdmans (xi). The first volume, *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek,* was published in 2010 by Stanley E. Porter, Jeffery T. Reed, and Matthew Brook O'Donnell and is composed of a textbook and an accompanying workbook. The third volume, an intermediate grammar, is in the process of being written, and the final volume, a book on exegesis and interpretation, is in the planning stage (xii).

Stanley E. Porter is currently president, dean, and professor of NT at McMaster Divinity College in Hamilton (Ontario). He has authored twenty-eight books, edited ninety volumes, and written over 300 journal articles and chapters in different disciplines of religious studies. He has published several publications in the field of NT textual criticism and actively participates in the current debate by calling scholarship to move away from an eclectic text and accept a single text model. Thus, without any doubt, the author knows the field of NT textual criticism.

Andrew W. Pitts is currently chair of the Biblical Studies Department and assistant professor of Biblical Studies and Christian Ministries at Arizona Christian University. He is the assigned coauthor of the forthcoming intermediate grammar.

Fundamentals Of New Testament Textual Criticism consists of thirteen chapters and an appendix, entitled *Tools for Further Text-Critical Study*. Each chapter ends with a summary, a list of key terminology, and a bibliography. At

the end of the book, there is an index of modern authors and one for ancient sources. There is no comprehensive bibliography at the end of the book.

In chapter one, they define textual criticism, introducing the traditional model, which seeks to recover the text of the autograph, and the sociohistorical model, which focusses on the transmission process itself. The authors indicate that they sympathize with the traditional model. In chapter two, they address the issue of the NT canon, taking a conservative standpoint by advocating that the formation of the canon was a result of reacting to heresies in the second century CE. Chapter three contains general information on ancient book making, literacy, ancient writing styles, writing materials, and methods of how the NT manuscripts are classified. Chapter four provides an overview of the major witnesses to the NT text, such as the Greek manuscripts, the early versions, and the patristic quotations. Chapter five describes the four major text-types. Chapter six addresses the issue of the definition and boundaries of a textual variant. Chapters seven to ten deal with text-critical methodologies. Chapter seven gives an overview on the four major approaches to NT textual criticism: Stemmatic, Majority Text, Eclectic, and Single Text. Chapters eight to ten focus on the current standard methodology, reasoned eclecticism, discussing the external evidences (ch. 8), the transcriptional probabilities (ch. 9), and the intrinsic probabilities (ch. 10). Chapter eleven presents a brief history of the modern critical editions, starting from Ximénes's edition and going to $NA^{27/28}$ and $UBS^{4/5}$. Chapter twelve provides a guide to the use of the text and the apparati of $NA^{27/28}$ and of $UBS^{4/5}$. In the final chapter, the authors address the issues of translating the NT into modern languages, with a special focus on English versions.

This book certainly is an easy read and thus presents what the title promises. The outline and the layout of the book serves its purpose well. The authors provide simple explanations of technical terms and the examples are well chosen.

Beginning with a critique of minor importance, primarily directed against the publisher, I asked myself why they were not able to match the cover's layout with the one used for *Fundamentals in New Testament Greek*, given the fact that they are part of the same series.

Focusing now on content, I observed many flaws that finally make me question the raison d'être of this book. First of all, the authors are too selective in presenting the material. In the beginning of chapter two, they point out that two main views exist on when the canonization of the NT took place. However, the rest of the chapter focuses only on one view, the traditional view. After providing an overview on the four major approaches to NT textual criticism in chapter seven, only the methodology of reasoned eclecticism (chs. 8–11), which is not even Stanley's favorite approach, is described in detail.

I observed at least two instances when the authors provide more detailed information later in the book on something mentioned previously. This is not beneficial, especially if the targeted readers are novices. For example, they state, "Because of its popularity, a later publisher referred to the text that resulted from Erasmus's efforts as the Textus Receptus." (74). Later in the book they identify the publisher as Elzevir (139). I cannot think of any

reason why they did not mention the publisher in the first instance. Another example is the initial reference to lectionaries. This large group of manuscripts is generally insufficiently described by scholars. In this book they introduce lectionaries as a key term, with only two explanatory sentences in the section where classification methods are discussed (49). Uninformed readers may ask what lectionaries are. They will have to read on a couple of pages before this question is answered (62–63). A cross-reference would have solved the problem.

On more than one occasion, I found the authors guilty of drawing untenable conclusions. For example, based on $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, a papyrus dated from 180–200 CE, which includes all Pauline Epistles (including Hebrews), except 2 Thessalonians and the Pastoral Epistles, the authors conclude that canonizing activities were taking place at the end of the second century CE. Because this conclusion is very legitimate, they further conclude that $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ most likely proves that "either Paul himself or his close traveling companions, which would have included his secretaries, fellow missionaries, and church planters," were already collecting these letters (14). This is quite a stretch! In another instance, the authors state, "the rapid spread of Christianity in the ancient world, therefore, accounts for the rapid production of NT books represented by the abundant number of manuscripts currently available" (37). The truth is that only a small percentage (less than 2.5 percent) of the available manuscripts are from the first century CE. The vast majority of available manuscripts (over 65 percent) were produced in the eleventh–fourteenth century CE. The authors give the wrong impression that most of the available manuscripts are from the early period, when Christianity was spreading.

In addition, the authors sometimes present information without enough nuance. For example, their remarks on literacy in the first century CE could be more nuanced in terms of what "reading" meant in the Greco-Roman culture. Richard Rohrbaugh's chapter on "Ancient Reading" in *The Social Sciences and NT Interpretation* (2014) provides helpful insights that would enrich this section. Another example is that they seem to take the questionable story of Tischendorf's discovery of Codex Sinaiticus with monks burning parchment leaves to heat their rooms at face value (56).

Of even more importance is the fact that the authors provide inaccurate information. It is known that the apparatus of Catholic Epistles in NA^{28} replaced $\mathfrak{M}$ by the letters "byz." The authors do not refer at all to "byz" in relation to the apparatus of NA^{28}, but point out only that "byz" is used in the apparatus of UBS$^{4/5}$ instead of the symbol $\mathfrak{M}$ that is used in the apparatus of NA$^{27/28}$ (162).

This leads to another major flaw of this book. In their guide for the text and the apparati of the UBS$^{4/5}$ and NA$^{27/28}$ (ch. 12), the authors discuss, in footnote one, the value of the NA^{28} edition (147). They conclude that based on the differences in the apparatus of the Catholic Epistles and the rest of the New Testament, NA^{28} or UBS^{5} could cause confusion for the students. For this reason they decide to discuss the apparati of UBS$^{4/5}$ and NA$^{27/28}$. This decision leads, in my opinion, to even more confusion, especially because of their insufficient treatment of the matter illustrated in the case of the use of

𝔐/byz. I think a mid-level introduction in textual criticism should provide a detailed explanation of the apparati only of the current critical editions of the Greek New Testament, since students will automatically look for the most current version. In addition, I really question whether a mid-level introduction in textual criticism is the right place to critique the current versions of the critical editions of the Greek New Testament.

I am sure that the authors' intention to simplify the subject matter, to provide a smooth entry in the given field for first- and second-year students, is well meant. However, it also raises a fundamental question concerning their underestimation of students' capacity. I am skeptical of the recent trend of producing more and more simplified books at the cost of comprehensiveness. I do not share the authors' evaluation of the three standard introductory books on the NT text by Aland & Aland (1989), Metzger & Ehrman (2005), and Parker (2008) as far too detailed for first- or second-year Greek students (xiii). I would prefer upcoming revised editions of these books, rather than incomplete mid-level introductions on textual criticism, as the one I have here reviewed.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Dominic Bornand

Sæbø, Magne, ed. *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. III: From Modernism to Post-Modernism. Part 2: The Twentieth Century—From Modernism to Post-Modernism*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015. 777 pp. Hardcover, EUR 150.00.

This volume completes the project *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament The History of Its Interpretation* (HBOT), edited by the Norwegian theologian Magne Sæbø, professor at MF Norwegian School of Theology. Since its initial planning around 1980, it now constitutes a major monument in Sæbø's contribution to scholarship. As he himself writes, the intention of the entire project was to contribute and further develop the tradition of Ludwig Diestel (*Geschichte des Alten Testamentes in der christliche Kirche*, 1869) and Fredric W. Farrar (*History of Interpretation*, 1886). HBOT is not alone as a recent multivolume project presenting the history of interpretation of Scripture. Others that can be mentioned are the *Bible de tous les Temps* (1984–1989) by Roman Catholic scholars; Henning Graf Reventlow's *Epochen der Bibelauslegung* (1990–2001); the *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scriptures* (2014), edited by T. C. Oden; the *Blackwell Bible Commentary* (2004–), edited by J. F. A. Sawyer, still to be completed; and finally the planned *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception* edited by Hans-Josef Klauck et al.

The first volume, part 1 (HBOT I/1), *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*, was published in 1996. It took us from the beginnings of Scriptural interpretation within the Bible itself up through Jewish and Christian Scriptural interpretation in antiquity. The second part (HBOT I/2) covers Christian and Jewish Scriptural interpretation in the Middle Ages. The second volume (HBOT II), *From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*,

𝔐/byz. I think a mid-level introduction in textual criticism should provide a detailed explanation of the apparati only of the current critical editions of the Greek New Testament, since students will automatically look for the most current version. In addition, I really question whether a mid-level introduction in textual criticism is the right place to critique the current versions of the critical editions of the Greek New Testament.

I am sure that the authors' intention to simplify the subject matter, to provide a smooth entry in the given field for first- and second-year students, is well meant. However, it also raises a fundamental question concerning their underestimation of students' capacity. I am skeptical of the recent trend of producing more and more simplified books at the cost of comprehensiveness. I do not share the authors' evaluation of the three standard introductory books on the NT text by Aland & Aland (1989), Metzger & Ehrman (2005), and Parker (2008) as far too detailed for first- or second-year Greek students (xiii). I would prefer upcoming revised editions of these books, rather than incomplete mid-level introductions on textual criticism, as the one I have here reviewed.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Dominic Bornand

Sæbø, Magne, ed. *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. III: From Modernism to Post-Modernism. Part 2: The Twentieth Century—From Modernism to Post-Modernism*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015. 777 pp. Hardcover, EUR 150.00.

This volume completes the project *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament The History of Its Interpretation* (HBOT), edited by the Norwegian theologian Magne Sæbø, professor at MF Norwegian School of Theology. Since its initial planning around 1980, it now constitutes a major monument in Sæbø's contribution to scholarship. As he himself writes, the intention of the entire project was to contribute and further develop the tradition of Ludwig Diestel (*Geschichte des Alten Testamentes in der christliche Kirche*, 1869) and Fredric W. Farrar (*History of Interpretation*, 1886). HBOT is not alone as a recent multivolume project presenting the history of interpretation of Scripture. Others that can be mentioned are the *Bible de tous les Temps* (1984–1989) by Roman Catholic scholars; Henning Graf Reventlow's *Epochen der Bibelauslegung* (1990–2001); the *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scriptures* (2014), edited by T. C. Oden; the *Blackwell Bible Commentary* (2004–), edited by J. F. A. Sawyer, still to be completed; and finally the planned *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception* edited by Hans-Josef Klauck et al.

The first volume, part 1 (HBOT I/1), *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*, was published in 1996. It took us from the beginnings of Scriptural interpretation within the Bible itself up through Jewish and Christian Scriptural interpretation in antiquity. The second part (HBOT I/2) covers Christian and Jewish Scriptural interpretation in the Middle Ages. The second volume (HBOT II), *From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*,

includes chapters on Scriptural interpretation in the Renaissance, Catholic Reforms, and the Reformation, and the establishment of the historical-critical method. The third volume, part 1 (HBOT III/1), *From Modernism to Post-Modernism* focuses on the nineteenth century, with the cultural context of biblical interpretation in this century, the increased knowledge of new areas, such as the historical, anthropological, sociological, and mythological context of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, a discussion of various geographical and confessional traditions, the development of the "History of Israel" school, higher and lower criticism, conservative approaches, and studies in the various sections of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, as well as the question of a "biblical theology" and the canon.

The second part of the final volume, HBOT III/2, follows much the same layout as the first (HBOT III/1). These two parts of the third volume allow comparatively more discussion of the timespan of the last two centuries, reflecting the expansion of the studies of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. It begins with some chapters addressing hermeneutical, linguistic, and institutional/social life questions. Then begins the topic of most of the chapters in this book, namely, the movement from a relatively homogenous scholarly field at the beginning of the twentieth century, finding a consensus in the historical-critical method and Wellhausen's Documentary Hypothesis, and a gradual development toward a more multifaceted field in studies of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, with a methodological pluralism both converging and diverging. Also here we find specific discussions of geographical and confessional traditions, together with special fields of study. The only chapter and theme I found missing among the chapters was one describing how archaeology has affected the studies of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. Yes, Albright and his disciples and critics are mentioned and discussed in some of the chapters, as well as the importance of newer finds of extrabiblical manuscripts and inscriptions for the study of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. Still, much is left to be said about the importance of archaeology for biblical studies.

Both the themes covered and selection of contributors here, as in the previous volumes, reflect an awareness of the growing importance of Jewish scholars in the last century. Part two contains twenty-five chapters written by twenty-three contributors, some of the most well-known scholars in the present field of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. It is not possible to enter into a discussion of each chapter here. But there are some overall observations that can be made. In general, the articles present the material in a relatively neutral way, and the authors include their own contributions at large, proportional to other authors. Needless to say, the quality is generally very high, with maybe two to three chapters that should have been refined and polished somewhat more before being sent off to press. But reading the succinct and clear style of Jean Louis Ska is simply a pleasure. Further, David Carr gives a lot of background information on Pentateuchal criticism that cannot be learned from a mere review of literature. Only an author who is personally familiar with the scholars in this field can write as in this chapter.

The name, topics, and reference indices will be much-welcomed tools for scholars working on specific topics. The extensive bibliographies given in all the chapters, with short summaries of the various contributions in the main text, give a quick reference and overview of a specific field. Even if the editor calls a certain overlap "regrettably unavoidable" (17), I must say that I found this to be one of the strengths of the collection. Reading the various chapters, I found my own research interests enlightened from various perspectives and authors. Eckart Otto's packed overview of the study of law and ethics, for example, is a treasure for any scholar interested in the field, even when one might disagree with specific points of the respective author. Further, Antti Laato's chapter on Nordic scholarship gave me an overview of the field in my own geographic location that I had not had before. I suspect others will find a similar appreciation of the material made available in their own fields and affiliations.

It remains only to thank Sæbø and the other contributors, as well as recommend Hebrew Bible/Old Testament scholars to at least familiarize themselves with what is available in these volumes for their specific studies. In the words of Benjamin Jowett, quoted by Sæbø at the end, concerning the Bible: "The book itself remains as at the first unchanged amid the changing interpretations of it." No doubt, an overview like the HBOT can truly be a bewildering experience. But taken a certain way, the history of interpretation and how Scripture has been received in multifarious ways, can help us become more attentive listeners and more acute, closer readers of the Word of God, which has spoken so meaningfully to successive generations.

Grimo, Norway Kenneth Bergland

Stefanovic, Ranko. *Plain Revelation*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2013. 296 pp. Softcover. $16.99.

Ranko Stefanovic is professor of New Testament at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. This is his second commentary on Revelation. The first, a verse-by-verse commentary entitled *Revelation of Jesus Christ*: *Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Andrews University Press, 2002), was more scholarly in its approach and went through two editions. This commentary is for a different audience. In his preface, Stefanovic describes his purpose: "To write a concise, user-friendly book on Revelation that would be accessible to all informed readers" (viii). He has achieved this purpose rather well.

Plain Revelation is quite readable and provides a concise commentary on Revelation that is accessible to the average reader who is generally informed on biblical matters. Stefanovic says that this commentary "is intended to be an introduction to my commentary, and can serve as a personal study guide, a study tool for small groups, and a textbook" (ibid.). His first commentary was a bit heavy, academically, for a more general audience. It worked fairly well for graduate classes on Revelation but not for typical readers. This one is much more suitable for a lay reader or even for college students taking a general

The name, topics, and reference indices will be much-welcomed tools for scholars working on specific topics. The extensive bibliographies given in all the chapters, with short summaries of the various contributions in the main text, give a quick reference and overview of a specific field. Even if the editor calls a certain overlap "regrettably unavoidable" (17), I must say that I found this to be one of the strengths of the collection. Reading the various chapters, I found my own research interests enlightened from various perspectives and authors. Eckart Otto's packed overview of the study of law and ethics, for example, is a treasure for any scholar interested in the field, even when one might disagree with specific points of the respective author. Further, Antti Laato's chapter on Nordic scholarship gave me an overview of the field in my own geographic location that I had not had before. I suspect others will find a similar appreciation of the material made available in their own fields and affiliations.

It remains only to thank Sæbø and the other contributors, as well as recommend Hebrew Bible/Old Testament scholars to at least familiarize themselves with what is available in these volumes for their specific studies. In the words of Benjamin Jowett, quoted by Sæbø at the end, concerning the Bible: "The book itself remains as at the first unchanged amid the changing interpretations of it." No doubt, an overview like the HBOT can truly be a bewildering experience. But taken a certain way, the history of interpretation and how Scripture has been received in multifarious ways, can help us become more attentive listeners and more acute, closer readers of the Word of God, which has spoken so meaningfully to successive generations.

Grimo, Norway Kenneth Bergland

Stefanovic, Ranko. *Plain Revelation*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2013. 296 pp. Softcover. $16.99.

Ranko Stefanovic is professor of New Testament at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. This is his second commentary on Revelation. The first, a verse-by-verse commentary entitled *Revelation of Jesus Christ*: *Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Andrews University Press, 2002), was more scholarly in its approach and went through two editions. This commentary is for a different audience. In his preface, Stefanovic describes his purpose: "To write a concise, user-friendly book on Revelation that would be accessible to all informed readers" (viii). He has achieved this purpose rather well.

Plain Revelation is quite readable and provides a concise commentary on Revelation that is accessible to the average reader who is generally informed on biblical matters. Stefanovic says that this commentary "is intended to be an introduction to my commentary, and can serve as a personal study guide, a study tool for small groups, and a textbook" (ibid.). His first commentary was a bit heavy, academically, for a more general audience. It worked fairly well for graduate classes on Revelation but not for typical readers. This one is much more suitable for a lay reader or even for college students taking a general

education class on Revelation. In fact, I used it this past year as a textbook for my Revelation classes, and it was received better than the previous textbook. I have not found a better commentary for a general audience, including as a textbook for a general education class on the book of Revelation, than this one. I would recommend its use for general readers.

That is not to say that the commentary is without certain weaknesses. I could enumerate many interpretive weaknesses in the commentary, yet that is not the purpose of this review. Every commentary has its interpretive weaknesses, and there is no end of debate regarding the best interpretation of many of the difficult passages in Revelation.

The commentary begins with a brief general introduction to the book, including issues of authorship and date, interpretive approaches to the book, and its organization and structure. Then Stefanovic moves through the book section by section, providing a fairly concise commentary, attempting to illuminate the biblical connections that enlighten the interpretation. He does not proceed verse by verse, but highlights the major passages and deals with major themes and concepts. The reader is provided with biblical and historical backgrounds to support the various interpretations.

The commentary is more unapologetically historicist in its interpretive approach than the earlier commentary. In the first commentary, Stefanovic largely avoided the language and conclusions of traditional historicism and came under criticism by Adventist readers, who expect a historicist interpretation. The second edition (2009) added some of the language of historicism to its interpretations. Finally, this new commentary is more willing to be clearly historicist, in line with standard Adventist interpretations, to a large degree. That is not to say that there are no departures from traditional Adventist interpretations, for there are a number of departures. However, the more normative interpretations are largely present, and Adventist readers should be more comfortable with this commentary than they were with the first one.

All in all, Stefanovic has produced a commentary that should meet the needs of a broad cross-section of readers, particularly those who are interested in a biblical historicist interpretation of the book of Revelation. It is up-to-date in terms of representing recent Adventist scholarship on Revelation. There really is nothing better that I have found currently that I can recommend for Adventist readers wanting to understand the book of Revelation without needing to have an academic background. It can serve also as an introductory textbook or study guide for Bible students.

Southern Adventist University Edwin Reynolds
Collegedale, Tennessee

Thiselton, Anthony C. *A Shorter Guide to the Holy Spirit: Bible, Doctrine, Experience*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016. x + 228 pp. Softcover, US$24.00.

Widely known for his numerous scholarly works in New Testament studies, particularly on 1 Corinthians, and in systematic theology, Anthony Thiselton, professor emeritus of Christian theology at the University of Nottingham,

education class on Revelation. In fact, I used it this past year as a textbook for my Revelation classes, and it was received better than the previous textbook. I have not found a better commentary for a general audience, including as a textbook for a general education class on the book of Revelation, than this one. I would recommend its use for general readers.

That is not to say that the commentary is without certain weaknesses. I could enumerate many interpretive weaknesses in the commentary, yet that is not the purpose of this review. Every commentary has its interpretive weaknesses, and there is no end of debate regarding the best interpretation of many of the difficult passages in Revelation.

The commentary begins with a brief general introduction to the book, including issues of authorship and date, interpretive approaches to the book, and its organization and structure. Then Stefanovic moves through the book section by section, providing a fairly concise commentary, attempting to illuminate the biblical connections that enlighten the interpretation. He does not proceed verse by verse, but highlights the major passages and deals with major themes and concepts. The reader is provided with biblical and historical backgrounds to support the various interpretations.

The commentary is more unapologetically historicist in its interpretive approach than the earlier commentary. In the first commentary, Stefanovic largely avoided the language and conclusions of traditional historicism and came under criticism by Adventist readers, who expect a historicist interpretation. The second edition (2009) added some of the language of historicism to its interpretations. Finally, this new commentary is more willing to be clearly historicist, in line with standard Adventist interpretations, to a large degree. That is not to say that there are no departures from traditional Adventist interpretations, for there are a number of departures. However, the more normative interpretations are largely present, and Adventist readers should be more comfortable with this commentary than they were with the first one.

All in all, Stefanovic has produced a commentary that should meet the needs of a broad cross-section of readers, particularly those who are interested in a biblical historicist interpretation of the book of Revelation. It is up-to-date in terms of representing recent Adventist scholarship on Revelation. There really is nothing better that I have found currently that I can recommend for Adventist readers wanting to understand the book of Revelation without needing to have an academic background. It can serve also as an introductory textbook or study guide for Bible students.

Southern Adventist University Edwin Reynolds
Collegedale, Tennessee

Thiselton, Anthony C. *A Shorter Guide to the Holy Spirit: Bible, Doctrine, Experience*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016. x + 228 pp. Softcover, US$24.00.

Widely known for his numerous scholarly works in New Testament studies, particularly on 1 Corinthians, and in systematic theology, Anthony Thiselton, professor emeritus of Christian theology at the University of Nottingham,

England, has recently authored two works on the Holy Spirit. In 2013 Eerdmans published *The Holy Spirit—in Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today*, a major contribution of 565 pages in biblical and historical theology, which was widely acclaimed by the scholarly community and received a book award from *Christianity Today*. Thiselton's latest work, *A Shorter Guide to the Holy Spirit: Bible, Doctrine, Experience*, seeks to be more accessible, as the title implies, but also adds new content not found in the first book, especially a section on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, rather than a historical account of writers on the Holy Spirit. An entire section on the experience of the Holy Spirit is new and engages the origins, global expansion, and contributions of Pentecostalism (vii).

There are three parts to this *Shorter Guide*. Part one includes seven chapters discussing the Spirit in biblical writings, in the Old Testament, the literature of intertestamental Judaism, synoptic Gospels, Pauline Epistles, the book of Acts, Johannine writings, and the rest of the New Testament. Much of the material in this new volume is a summary of the larger work, yet each of the major texts is briefly discussed, and the most relevant information is adequately presented.

Part two examines doctrinal themes, many of which have been the cause of numerous discussions and debates throughout history. The section begins with a discussion of the place of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity and what key writers have said about the Trinity. Given the resurgence of anti-Trinitarianism in evangelical Christianity, this section is particularly good in presenting key biblical texts and historical and theological ideas on the doctrine of the Trinity. The next chapter is a brief excursus on the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ, which is followed by a survey of the relationship between the Spirit and the Church. The operations of the Spirit in revelation and inspiration and in the sanctification of believers are treated next. The last doctrinal subject is personal eschatology and the role of the Spirit in the completion of God's work in the life of a believer.

Part three focuses on Pentecostalism and the experiences, historical and global origins, and current issues in this more recent Christian tradition. This section captures some of the important issues of Pentecostal experiential hermeneutics and worship, where the role and presence of the Holy Spirit are crucial. Pentecostal authors are carefully and honestly engaged, compared, and critiqued. This section is one of the best contributions of this book. Chapter fifteen discusses the self-awareness and diversity of Pentecostal thought today and gives a brief summary of some important Pentecostal thinkers: Amos Yong, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, Frank Macchia, and Stephen Land and Simon Chan. The chapter also discusses some Pentecostal issues, such as the baptism of the Spirit, divine healing, the prosperity gospel, and hermeneutics. The topic of hermeneutics is taken up in more details in chapter sixteen and wrestles with the tension between the subjective experience of the Holy Spirit in the interpretation of Scripture and the more objective guidance of tradition and fixed rules of hermeneutics.

Overall, *A Shorter Guide to the Holy Spirit* is a well-written book; and, in spite of its conciseness in some aspects and content, it is nonetheless a valuable

contribution to this Christian teaching. A few observations stand out in my mind. First, the book begins too abruptly without a good introduction, a shortcoming that is recurring in the lack of introduction for some chapters. Likely this is caused by the fact that this book was written in response to the request of the publisher of the first larger volume. The book's premise is the publisher's request for a smaller book and the preface is written in relationship to the larger book. It would be hard for those who have not read the first volume to understand much of the preface. This book needs to be more self-sustaining and self-contained. Thus, naturally, any reader of this *Shorter Guide* who wants to dig deeper into what the author presents is invited to pick up the earlier publication. Nonetheless, a strength of this book is Thiselton's drawing from information already published in many of his prior works. *A Shorter Guide* becomes a capstone to his publishing career.

As already mentioned in my summary of part three, this book offers a good dialogue with Pentecostal authors. This I consider to be one of the best contributions of this book. Frank Macchia, a Pentecostal scholar who is regularly referred to in the book, praised it as a "wonderful book on the Holy Spirit" and esteems it as "concise yet expansive in its range of issues and its choice of dialogue patterns" (back cover).

Theologians, pastors, and lay leaders will appreciate this work for its conciseness and engagement with the most relevant biblical and theological material on the Holy Spirit.

Andrews University Denis Fortin

Tonstad, Sigve K. *God of Sense and Traditions of Non-Sense*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016. 476 pp. Softcover, US$43.20.

Not many books are philosophically profound, thoroughly researched, rigorously argued, elegantly written, and personally moving. But Sigve Tonstad's recent offering, *God of Sense and Traditions of Non-Sense,* displays all these qualities. It deals with what has always been a central—if not *the* central—issue in philosophy of religion, namely, the problem of evil. It painstakingly develops a perspective that, while it is not widely shared among contemporary philosophers, rests on sophisticated biblical interpretations and illuminating appeals to a wide range of literature, from the apologetics of Origen, an early Christian thinker, to the novels of Fyodor Dostoyevsky and Mark Twain. In the urgency of its tone and the sweeping landscape it traverses, not to mention the explanation it offers, Tonstad's discussion bears comparison to some of the most admirable treatments of the topic in recent years, such as Eleanore Stump's magisterial tome, *Wandering in Darkness: Narrative and the Problem of Suffering.*

How are we to make sense of suffering—not just the day-to-day inconveniences we encounter or even the inevitable losses we all experience—but horrific events, such as the Holocaust? To be specific, how can we ever reconcile the occurrence of such events with the idea of a divine reality whose central characteristic is love? These are the questions this book addresses.

contribution to this Christian teaching. A few observations stand out in my mind. First, the book begins too abruptly without a good introduction, a shortcoming that is recurring in the lack of introduction for some chapters. Likely this is caused by the fact that this book was written in response to the request of the publisher of the first larger volume. The book's premise is the publisher's request for a smaller book and the preface is written in relationship to the larger book. It would be hard for those who have not read the first volume to understand much of the preface. This book needs to be more self-sustaining and self-contained. Thus, naturally, any reader of this *Shorter Guide* who wants to dig deeper into what the author presents is invited to pick up the earlier publication. Nonetheless, a strength of this book is Thiselton's drawing from information already published in many of his prior works. *A Shorter Guide* becomes a capstone to his publishing career.

As already mentioned in my summary of part three, this book offers a good dialogue with Pentecostal authors. This I consider to be one of the best contributions of this book. Frank Macchia, a Pentecostal scholar who is regularly referred to in the book, praised it as a "wonderful book on the Holy Spirit" and esteems it as "concise yet expansive in its range of issues and its choice of dialogue patterns" (back cover).

Theologians, pastors, and lay leaders will appreciate this work for its conciseness and engagement with the most relevant biblical and theological material on the Holy Spirit.

Andrews University Denis Fortin

Tonstad, Sigve K. *God of Sense and Traditions of Non-Sense*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016. 476 pp. Softcover, US$43.20.

Not many books are philosophically profound, thoroughly researched, rigorously argued, elegantly written, and personally moving. But Sigve Tonstad's recent offering, *God of Sense and Traditions of Non-Sense,* displays all these qualities. It deals with what has always been a central—if not *the* central—issue in philosophy of religion, namely, the problem of evil. It painstakingly develops a perspective that, while it is not widely shared among contemporary philosophers, rests on sophisticated biblical interpretations and illuminating appeals to a wide range of literature, from the apologetics of Origen, an early Christian thinker, to the novels of Fyodor Dostoyevsky and Mark Twain. In the urgency of its tone and the sweeping landscape it traverses, not to mention the explanation it offers, Tonstad's discussion bears comparison to some of the most admirable treatments of the topic in recent years, such as Eleanore Stump's magisterial tome, *Wandering in Darkness: Narrative and the Problem of Suffering.*

How are we to make sense of suffering—not just the day-to-day inconveniences we encounter or even the inevitable losses we all experience—but horrific events, such as the Holocaust? To be specific, how can we ever reconcile the occurrence of such events with the idea of a divine reality whose central characteristic is love? These are the questions this book addresses.

The prologue sets a somber tone, describing the deportation of hundreds of Jews from Oslo, Norway, in 1942, to their subsequent extermination in Auschwitz. It is clear from the very beginning that Tonstad, like Marilyn McCord Adams, wants to tackle the problem of evil in its most perplexing form, namely, the occurrence of "horrendous evils," evils that defy all conventional "theodicies," or philosophical explanations. Such evils, Tonstad argues, require nothing less than a perspective that takes full account of the demonic. Only the existence of the devil, namely, Satan and Lucifer—God's powerful antagonist and leader of a host of fallen angels—provides an adequate explanation for the scope and intensity of human suffering. It is he, not God, who is to blame for all the misery that afflicts us.

The actual source of our suffering is not that easy to see, however, because God's archenemy is also an arch-deceiver, the "father of lies," as the Bible portrays him. Besides defying God's authority and inflicting misery on God's creatures, Lucifer's rebellion also involves generating suspicion about God's goodness.

In order to respond to this challenge effectively, it would not be enough for God simply to eliminate His enemies. God must expose the falsity of Satan's charges, and this takes time. But the evidence is there. Properly interpreted, the Bible provides abundant and eminently rational evidence that God is worthy of our trust and that God's enemies have not told the truth about God. "The God of sense" makes sense, as the record of God's dealings with human beings throughout biblical history demonstrates.

In spite of the biblical testimony to the God of sense, and an appreciation of the devil's significance among early Christian thinkers like Origen, later developments eclipsed both of these themes. The figure of the devil became less vivid in the thinking of theologians, and instead of appreciating the evidence that supports faith in God, they emphasized God's inscrutability and God's power. In time, the idea that we should yield to God's authority, whether we understand God's ways or not, resulted in the elevation of human authority—ecclesiastical and political—as something not to be questioned.

To summarize Tonstad's account, the elevation of unquestioned authority and the fading of the idea of the devil paved the way, over the long course of history, for something like the Holocaust. Christians became willing to accept authority, whether or not it made sense, even when it authorized things that were horrible. Had Christians retained a vivid sense of the demonic, he strongly suggests, and insisted on rational evidence to support their views of God—and anyone supposedly acting in God's stead—they might have recognized and resisted the evil that Naziism represented.

As Tonstad interprets it, the central theme of biblical history is the long process by which God incrementally reveals God's true character, exposes the falsity of Satan's charges, and inspires creaturely loyalty. Because God places great value on human freedom, God never resorts to coercion. "Absence of divine intervention," says Tonstad, "and intervention by unexpected means are the pieces by which the Bible brings to view what I call a *God of Sense"* (xx). Still, surprising as they may be at first, God's ways do make

sense. There is common ground, indeed, an "overlap" between the values of God and humanity (257). And these values provide a basis for an intelligent appreciation of God's character and render fully rational a decision to respond to God with loyalty and love. The priority of revelation to obedience is a persistent theme of Tonstad's proposal (cf. 162).

To support this conclusion, Tonstad carefully considers a variety of biblical narratives, and his treatment of history's most famous sufferer is particularly illustrative. Contrary to many interpretations, he maintains that God does provide Job with an explanation for his suffering—one consistent with the frame story, in which God and Satan confront each other. So, when God speaks from the whirlwind, it is not to cow Job into submission, but to reveal the source of his suffering. Satan is at work in the world, and he, not God, is the one afflicting Job. In subsequent chapters, Tonstad argues that God's archenemy plays a central role in the Gospels' accounts of Jesus' life and provides an indispensable backdrop to the theology of the Apostle Paul.

Tonstad saves the most dramatic phase of his discussion for the concluding section of the book, where he examines the last book in the Bible. As he describes it, Revelation brings to a powerful, indeed breathtaking, culmination the various portrayals of God in previous portions of the canon. And here the theme of "divine transparency" emerges with striking clarity. In Revelation's account of God's climactic encounter with cosmic rebellion, we are presented with "a spectacular feat of divine persuasion" (365), a feat that reaches its climax, not in the ultimate restoration of the universe to its primeval beauty, but in the spectacle of the slaughtered Lamb that evokes heaven's silence.

Tonstad's insistence on the rational basis of God's relation to creation emerges in assertions like this: "On the one hand . . . , we have a God who is committed to transparency. On the other hand, we see creatures endowed with the ability to understand" (368). And to enable them to understand, God allows Satan to reveal himself and thereby expose who/what it is that lies behind the "horrendous realities" that pervade human history. Ultimately, the devil's activity ends in self-destruction. And God's nonuse of force emerges in striking contrast to the violence perpetrated by God's supreme enemy. God earns the admiration, the worship, of the heavenly council with a vivid display of the divine character. "The last book of the Bible reveals a God of sense and a God whose ways are seen to make sense" (403).

"For the rough contours of the book," Tonstad states in his Acknowledgments, "I owe the most to the late A. Graham Maxwell" (xi). And those familiar with Maxwell's thought will find a good deal in the book that reminds them of him. (Maxwell was for many years a professor of religion at Loma Linda University, where Tonstad attended medical school.) Maxwell was fond of saying, "God is not the person his enemies say he is," and in a way this statement adumbrates the central themes of Tonstad's opus: *God has enemies*, and *God responds by telling the truth about himself.* Maxwell was also fond of quoting this statement of Ellen White's, "God never asks us to believe, without giving sufficient evidence upon which to base our faith." God's true character is the central issue in the cosmic conflict that occupies Tonstad, and

the conflict is finally resolved when God's creatures accept the evidence that love stands behind all that God says and does and the falsity of the devil's charges is fully exposed.

Memorable theological proposals generate serious questions, and I found myself asking a number as I read. One concerns Tonstad's insistence that faith is reasonable, that trust in God makes eminent sense. For others, faith is indeed reasonable, but only up to a point; it is not completely transparent to reason and is accurately described as surpassing reason. To be sure, finding evidence to support one's beliefs can make an important contribution to a responsible religious commitment, but, to some extent, faith involves a trust that goes beyond the evidence that reason provides. Otherwise, it seems, faith would become a product of reason, a human achievement rather than a divine gift. I wonder if Tonstad's own argument that "narrative logic" is superior to "philosophical logic" comes close to conceding this point (48–49).

In his emphasis on cosmic conflict, Tonstad also offers a provocative reading of early Christian thought. According to standard accounts, the major doctrinal threat during the church's formative years came from inadequate conceptions of Christ and the greatest theological accomplishment of the early church was the development christological orthodoxy. As Tonstad sees it, however, these concerns represent an unfortunate contraction from the bigger story that earlier Christians, like Origen, had to tell—one that involved Lucifer's rebellion and the superiority of freedom to power in resolving the cosmic conflict. When theologians focused their attention on matters such as personal salvation and doctrines like the trinity and the nature of Christ, he argues, they were in effect developing "a more detailed picture within a much smaller frame" (52). For some, this comparison underestimates the achievements of the Councils of Nicea (325 CE) and Chalcedon (451 CE). Emil Brunner's assessment is representative. "Had Arius conquered," he states, "it would have been all over with the Christian Church" (*Dogmatics,* 1:239).

One of the most impressive features of Tonstad's project is the remarkable range of scholarly and literary material he considers in developing his "luciferous theodicy," to use Stephen T. Davis's expression. But given the immense number of works he cites, some sources are strangely missing. I wonder why he does not refer to the epic poetry that provides one of the most vivid portraits of Satan in all literature, namely, *Paradise Lost.* But John Milton's name appears in neither the indices nor the twenty-five-page bibliography.

Another name curiously missing from Tonstad's discussion is that of Gregory A. Boyd, a contemporary theologian who develops a cosmic conflict theodicy in two substantial books—*God at War: The Bible and Spiritual Conflict* (InterVarsity, 1997) and *Satan and the Problem of Evil: Constructing a Trinitarian Warfare Theodicy* (InterVarsity, 2001). Boyd argues that the devil and other fallen angels are actively involved in the world, bringing suffering and pain to the earth's inhabitants in a variety of ways, including disease and natural disasters. Boyd sees the demonic at work in the turbulent history of the planet, in cataclysmic natural phenomena, as well as in animal and

human suffering. Moreover, as Boyd construes it, this conflict also involves violent struggles between good and bad angels. (A text he often cites in this connection is Dan 10:13, where an angel attributes his/her delay in answering Daniel's prayer to what appears to be demonic interference.)

Boyd's description of cosmic conflict touches on an important issue for a theodicy like Tonstad's. If there are powerful personal forces at work in the world who inflict pain and suffering on living beings, just how do we identify them, or where do we locate them? At what level(s) of existence or experience do they operate? Are they somehow responsible for volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, tsunamis, droughts, tornadoes? Are they active in the production of harmful biological forms, such as HIV, and the Ebola and Zika viruses? On the other hand, if we think of them largely in connection with moral evils, such as the Holocaust, as Tonstad does, just how do these evil personages go about exploiting human thoughts and emotions?

For some people, the concept that there could be a real conflict between God and Satan will raise questions. How, for example, could a superior intelligence, indeed the highest of created beings, possibly think of himself as a plausible rival to God? If God brought the universe into being, and God's power sustains all that exists, moment by moment, Lucifer must have realized that God could, in an instant, completely annihilate him. So, what did he hope to gain by contesting God's supremacy? We may also wonder how other intelligent beings could be susceptible to Lucifer's wiles. What was deficient about their powers of perception? Did they not realize that there was no possibility of deposing God? That God's infinite resourcefulness would ultimately bring their rebellion to naught?

In this connection, I suspect that the crucial question was not whether the creatures would submit to God's superior power, but whether or not they would offer God heartfelt love and loyalty. So, it was not God's supremacy that Lucifer brought into question, but God's character—not God's power, but God's trustworthiness. Was God really the person God claimed to be?

Putting things this way raises further questions of its own, however, questions concerning the a priori assumptions on which any claim to know something ultimately rests, or as some refer to them, the "transcendentals" of human knowledge. The thesis of Tonstad's discussion is that God's true nature emerges in spite of the prevarications of God's archenemy through a long series of revelatory events, and it finally becomes clear to careful thinkers that God is indeed the person God claims to be, Someone worthy of unstinting love and devotion.

If we reflect carefully on the activity of knowing, however, there appears to be something peculiar about the idea that we acquire the confidence that God is trustworthy through a process of rational inquiry. According to philosophers such as Bernard Lonergan (see *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding,* 1970), every claim to know something expresses a fundamental epistemic confidence that our minds afford us a reliable grasp of reality. But if God is by definition the source of all that is, the One whose power upholds everything that counts as evidence and the operations of our minds as well, then every

claim to know something implicitly expresses an underlying confidence in God. We cannot avoid assuming that God is trustworthy to begin with.

Some readers will also find Tonstad's objections to Augustine's reflections on evil puzzling. He admits that the great theologian did not dispense with the notion of a cosmic conflict, but in his view the story, as Augustine tells it, has been "bleached" of its earlier power (50), and Augustine's concept of evil as a privation of the good is seriously deficient (356). For many, however, Augustine's reflections on evil are enormously helpful, and in some ways they actually support Tonstad's central concern. There is no question, as Tonstad argues, that evil confronts us as a powerful, virtually palpable force, as the very figure of the devil suggests. But Augustine's insight is not that evil is less than horrible, but that, strictly speaking, it has no positive ontological status. By itself, evil is literally nothing, no-thing. The point is that evil is never "by itself." It "exists" only as the corruption of something essentially good. But if evil is parasitic on the good, then the greater the original good, the greater the potential for evil. This fits nicely with the concept that the supreme personification of evil is nothing other than the highest created being, Lucifer, the archangel, whose magnificent original qualities are bent to serve perfidious ends. If anything, such a view of evil, and of God's archenemy, would seem to bolster, rather than detract from, Tonstad's theodicy.

Whatever the questions that *God of Sense* raises, I doubt that they detract from Tonstad's accomplishment. Indeed, when viewed alongside the dramatic scope of his undertaking, and the beauty of its presentation, such questions may amount to nothing more than quibbles. After all, a grand narrative does not stoop to answer questions; it transcends them. And that, in essence, is what *God of Sense* provides: not a sustained argument, not an exercise in discursive reasoning—however admirable the author's forensic skills may be—but a powerful narrative, a multifaceted story of the greatest Love in the universe relentlessly pursuing the objects of its affection until they—we—can no longer wonder, or can only wonder, that we are cared for in ways that can only be imagined, but never adequately conceived. It is no wonder that Tonstad finds the climax of the cosmic story he so eloquently portrays in the stunned silence of the heavenly court.

Loma Linda University Richard Rice
Loma Linda, California

Vanhoozer, Kevin J., and Daniel J. Treier. *Theology and the Mirror of Scripture: A Mere Evangelical Account*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2015. 301 pp. Softcover, US$26.00.

Theology and the Mirror of Scripture is the first volume in the *Studies in Christian Doctrine and Scripture* promoting constructive, creative evangelical engagement between Scripture, doctrine, and traditions. The authors and also editors for these *Studies*—Kevin J. Vanhoozer, research professor of systematic theology at Trinity Evangelical School; and Daniel J. Treier, Blanchard Professor of Theology at Wheaton College—provide a

claim to know something implicitly expresses an underlying confidence in God. We cannot avoid assuming that God is trustworthy to begin with.

Some readers will also find Tonstad's objections to Augustine's reflections on evil puzzling. He admits that the great theologian did not dispense with the notion of a cosmic conflict, but in his view the story, as Augustine tells it, has been "bleached" of its earlier power (50), and Augustine's concept of evil as a privation of the good is seriously deficient (356). For many, however, Augustine's reflections on evil are enormously helpful, and in some ways they actually support Tonstad's central concern. There is no question, as Tonstad argues, that evil confronts us as a powerful, virtually palpable force, as the very figure of the devil suggests. But Augustine's insight is not that evil is less than horrible, but that, strictly speaking, it has no positive ontological status. By itself, evil is literally nothing, no-thing. The point is that evil is never "by itself." It "exists" only as the corruption of something essentially good. But if evil is parasitic on the good, then the greater the original good, the greater the potential for evil. This fits nicely with the concept that the supreme personification of evil is nothing other than the highest created being, Lucifer, the archangel, whose magnificent original qualities are bent to serve perfidious ends. If anything, such a view of evil, and of God's archenemy, would seem to bolster, rather than detract from, Tonstad's theodicy.

Whatever the questions that *God of Sense* raises, I doubt that they detract from Tonstad's accomplishment. Indeed, when viewed alongside the dramatic scope of his undertaking, and the beauty of its presentation, such questions may amount to nothing more than quibbles. After all, a grand narrative does not stoop to answer questions; it transcends them. And that, in essence, is what *God of Sense* provides: not a sustained argument, not an exercise in discursive reasoning—however admirable the author's forensic skills may be—but a powerful narrative, a multifaceted story of the greatest Love in the universe relentlessly pursuing the objects of its affection until they—we—can no longer wonder, or can only wonder, that we are cared for in ways that can only be imagined, but never adequately conceived. It is no wonder that Tonstad finds the climax of the cosmic story he so eloquently portrays in the stunned silence of the heavenly court.

Loma Linda University Richard Rice
Loma Linda, California

Vanhoozer, Kevin J., and Daniel J. Treier. *Theology and the Mirror of Scripture: A Mere Evangelical Account*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2015. 301 pp. Softcover, US$26.00.

Theology and the Mirror of Scripture is the first volume in the *Studies in Christian Doctrine and Scripture* promoting constructive, creative evangelical engagement between Scripture, doctrine, and traditions. The authors and also editors for these *Studies*—Kevin J. Vanhoozer, research professor of systematic theology at Trinity Evangelical School; and Daniel J. Treier, Blanchard Professor of Theology at Wheaton College—provide a

normative proposal for doing evangelical theology by offering "a theological prolegomenon and ecclesiological perspective for orthodox, pietist, Protestant ecumenism" (23–24).

The book is full of echoes, analogies, and imageries of the past. The title *Theology and the Mirror of Scripture* echoes Richard Rorty's *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. The book's subtitle *A Mere Evangelical Account* parodies C. S. Lewis's *Mere Christianity*, indicating the intended ecclesiology. The book starts with an *Unscientific Preface,* although not mentioning explicitly Kierkegaard, and goes on with a confession using the tone of Augustine. The intended goal of the book to achieve an evangelical catholicity matches the linguistic style that renews the spirit of landmark contributions in intellectual and theological history.

This prolegomenon is divided into two parts: Part 1, "The Agenda: The Material and Formal Principles of Evangelical Theology" (chs. 1–2), describes theological ontology and epistemology. Part 2, "The Analysis" (chs. 3–6), corresponds to the actual practice of doing evangelical theology, including reflection on wisdom (ch. 3), theological interpretation of Scripture (hereafter TIS) (ch. 4), ecclesiology (ch. 5), and issues related to the wider scholarly community (ch. 6), followed by the conclusion. The number of pages is evenly distributed between parts one and two, despite the difference in the number of chapters.

Chapter one, "The Gospel of God and the God of the Gospel: The Reality *Behind* the Mirror," focuses on theological ontology. At the outset, the question of theological unity among evangelicals is problematized by the absence of a defined theological core with no magisterium to emit judgments when facing theological disagreement (46). This complicates the landscape for evangelical identity and programmatic future. The proposal imagines the theological substance using a nautical analogy of an "anchor" instead of static proposals (i.e., boundary or centered analogies). The anchor analogy allows some doctrinal fixation and delimited flexibility. The substance of such "anchor" corresponds to a Trinitarian, crucicentric emphasis (78–79). This proposal is not intended to be "an exact science" (51), nor a method (126). The *telos* of such theology does not aim to produce foundationalist knowledge, but the formation of wise judgments. These procedures access the knowledge of God through the divine economy (57) targeting what God is in himself. Although the authors use the language of "being" (66), they are not interested in metaphysical speculation, but in the divine identity that self-communicates in speech and acts in the soteriological narrative.

Chapter two, "From Canonical Cradle to Doctrinal Development: The Authority of the Mirror," presents a theological epistemology. It proposes a *critical biblicism* that gives theological currency to the variegated literary forms and contents within Scriptures looking for patterns of biblical reasoning. Its epistemic strategy is to validate testimony as reliable. The chapter reacts to naïve biblicism by broadening the concept of authority pertaining intrinsically to the canon toward a larger domain that includes its interpretative reception. By emphasizing "apostolicity" before "catholicity," the authors posit tradition

with ministerial, derivative authority while maintaining *sola scriptura* with magisterial authority (117). The goal is to provide a blueprint that holds the tension between theological unity in essentials and diversity in nonessentials for the sake of right understanding, wise embodiment, and mission.

Part two, "The Practice of Evangelical Theology," analyses how the implementation ought to be done, capitalizing on the idea of "practice" and "art" instead of scientific methodology. Each chapter in this section starts with a theological reading of 1 Corinthians, addressing the issues under discussion. Chapter three, "In Search of Wisdom," conceptualizes theology as a sapiential enterprise, making wisdom the end or outcome of mirroring Scripture (i.e., teleological principle). The discussion is extended to prolegomena, theological education, and the fragmentation of theological disciplines.

Chapter four, "In Need of Theological Exegesis," provides the accounts for ecclesiastical apostolicity through a theological practice that exegetes the canon, creed, culture, and their mutual relations. It offers a series of clarifications and defenses of TIS, concluding that wisdom bridges the gap between historical exegesis and the formation of theological concepts and judgments. With the aid of insights from pragmatist and ordinary language theory, the proposal rejects the mesmerizing appeal to rationalist epistemology. Instead, it nuances the rational apparatus within habits and practices of social activity. Such is the link of doctrinal concepts to ecclesiology (the locus where such practice happens) and pneumatology (the agent who guides the conceptual development of such practices).

Chapter five considers the ecclesiology of the proposal, with special focus on catholicity and ecumenism. It describes the level of ecumenical relations based on correspondence as a three-leveled dogmatic rank that informs the engagement among churches and within congregations. The proposal is missiological and seeks to reestablish the currency of "tradition" within evangelicalism.

Chapter six, "In Pursuit of Scholarly Excellence," discusses how this proposal could be actualized by means of appropriation of wise judgments in constructing the literary materials of the Bible with synthetic creativity. It also looks for the systematicity that attests to the coherence of the interconnections of the parts to the whole. Then, it moves toward dogmatic focus by bridging and uniting the fragmented disciplines of biblical, theological, and practical studies. Also, the authors provide eight typologies of current theology that model and open avenues for future evangelical scholarship.

As I move to the assessment of Vanhoozer's and Treier's normative theological proposal for evangelicals, I note that the book is well researched, following logically from a programmatic agenda to the analysis. The footnotes converse mainly with contemporary authors, despite the intention to honor the creedal marks of the church. Although the intention of the proposal is ambitious—nothing less than the attempt to rekindle a revival movement—the description of the theological state of affairs is just sufficiently argued in order to transition to the constructive and prescriptive portions. As any book of creative power, it provides food for thought, and

so I offer assessment related to two areas of the proposed ecclesiology: First, the communitarian emphasis adopted in the prolegomenon, and second, the use of the creedal marks of the church, particularly, on the limitation of reflection on holiness, and the theological substance in the conceptualization of catholicity.

1. The authors acknowledge the inclusion of the doctrine of the church to the realm of their *first theology* (12–13). Previously, Vanhoozer argued that first theology focuses on the relation between God and Scripture (see his earlier account of prolegomenon in *First Theology: Essays on God, Scripture, and Hermeneutics* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002], 30). Later, Vanhoozer asked: "Should ecclesiology be 'first theology'?" by characterizing how the cultural-linguistic turn of George Lindbeck makes the church the first principle of Christian theology (*The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005], 155). However, *Theology and the Mirror of Scripture* offers an increased communitarian emphasis encompassing theological interpretation in the church. While this move should be commended for avoiding isolationism and the necessity to do theology not in the abstract but in the ecclesiastical concrete forms of embodiment, also it should be acknowledged that this communitarianism may, in practice, become a way of giving extracanonical normative interpretative authority.

2. Although the book's ecclesiology emphasizes the marks of the church (oneness, apostolicity, catholicity), as expressed in the Nicene Creed, it under-develops "holiness." If the mark "holiness" would be further elaborated, it could build bridges between dogmatics and moral theory. The authors could have connected "holiness" to the well-developed aspects of phronetic wisdom and the eschatological-ethical dimension of mirroring Scriptures. In particular, the authors could have developed an application of the eschatological paradigm in Christian ethics. Although they state their attempt to interpret theology in an eschatological way (10), they do not fully explore how this re-eschatologization of Christianity may affect their theological construction as it relates to ethics and the holiness of the church.

In regard to catholicity, the authors fill its theological content as the consensus of the whole church expressed as orthodoxy (116). Yet, they argue that what is authoritative is not the individual concepts of the past, but the judgments which were emerged (115). This rehabilitates the creeds even if their metaphysical framework is denied. The value of catholicity is in the theological development by the reception of the gospel throughout space, time, and culture. This makes catholicity intrinsically related to tradition and cross-cultural mission. The book elaborates mainly the quantitative aspect of catholicity, focusing—using the language of Avery Dulles—on the breadth (mission and communion) and length (tradition and development) of catholicity, but lacking the qualitative dimension, namely, the heights (the fullness of God) and depths (anthropology) of catholicity (cf. Avery Dulles, *The Catholicity of the Church* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1985]). If indeed the book attempts to bring ecclesiology into the realm of first theology, it

should articulate the qualitative aspect of the catholicity of the church with divine catholicity. Also, I would have liked to have seen the book interacting with catholicity within a comprehensive eschatological framework that differentiates an eschatological maximum from a historical minimum catholicity (cf. Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*, [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 266). In this way, catholicity would theologically predicate not only ecclesiology but also other theological loci.

Overall, *Theology and the Mirror of Scripture* is an important contribution that will be helpful to church members, pastors, and theologians interested in the evangelical ethos, constructive systematic theology, Protestant ecumenism, TIS, and the often forgotten evangelical ecclesiology.

Berrien Springs, Michigan Elmer A. Guzman