

them to be in a relationship of complementarity. Augustine is thus in this matter a culminator and a tradent to subsequent generations.

It is clear that Merkel's slender work should hold deep interest, not only for students of early Christian *Dogmengeschichte*, but also for NT scholars, especially those engaged in gospel research. As Merkel rightly says in his preface, such studies and anthologies as this one perform a great service in making us aware of how historically conditioned our own exegetical judgments are.

Andrews University

ROBERT M. JOHNSTON

Müller, Richard. *Adventisten—Sabbat—Reformation. Geht das Ruhetagsverständnis der Adventisten bis zur Zeit der Reformation zurück? Eine theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Studia Theologica Lundensia, No. 38. Lund: Gleerup, 1979. 251 pp. Paperback. Swedish Crowns 50.00.

The question of Adventism's relationship to the Reformation is undoubtedly of considerable interest. In the present study Richard Müller, a lecturer at Newbold College, England, explores this relationship in terms of the question of the Sabbath. "Can the Adventist understanding of the Sabbath question be traced back to the time of the Reformation?" Müller asks in the subtitle of the volume here under review.

It was the contention of English Seventh Day Baptists that their Sabbath beliefs derived from the continental Anabaptists, and since Seventh Day Baptists were in fact instrumental in bringing the belief in the seventh-day Sabbath to the attention of the early Adventists, it might be assumed that a direct line of influence extends from the Reformation, i.e., from some section of the reformed camp, to the Adventists of the nineteenth century. Müller is obviously convinced that such a line of influence does in principle exist, and he sets out to document it in this study (actually his doctoral dissertation for the University of Lund, Sweden, photomechanically reproduced from the typescript). It is a long line, and in a relatively short study such as the present one, selectivity of primary source material, as well as brevity of description, is the order.

The book is divided into three parts. The first—and most substantial one—deals with the question of the Sabbath at the time of the Reformation. An introductory chapter provides some perspective by outlining the medieval as well as the sixteenth-century Roman Catholic position on the question of the day of rest (Sunday).

Chaps. 2 and 3 deal first with Luther's and then with Calvin's understanding of the Sabbath question. Being the progenitors of two somewhat different schools of theology with a definite bearing on the Sabbath question and its subsequent history, the choice is obvious. The focus is on the idea and theology of the Sabbath; and in dealing with these reformers, Müller places the matter in the context of their theology and hermeneutical principles and consequently seeks to outline briefly their position on such issues as the authority of Scripture, the relation of the Testaments, the question of the Law at large, etc. Müller is intent on laying bare the bones of the question and does succeed in a measure.

Although Müller clearly documents a difference in Luther's and Calvin's position on the Law he arrives at the conclusion, somewhat surprisingly, that the two reformers are in essential agreement on the question of the day of rest (p. 90). Müller therefore sees no relationship between Calvin's theology on the Sabbath/Sunday question and that of later Puritanism (p. 91). Can this be so? Is Puritan sabbatarianism unrelated to Calvin's theology? In a very specific sense the answer may be "yes," since Calvin, like Luther, rejected the idea of a sacred Sunday, as much as he rejected the idea of a sacred seventh day. Indeed, in his *Institutes* Calvin went out of the way to call the Roman Catholic Sunday a "Jewish notion." Yet both reformers considered *a day*, any day, necessary for worship—Luther on the basis of natural law; Calvin, however (and this must be the crucial difference), on the basis of revelation as well. A day of rest in Calvin's thinking had a divine mandate, as testified by Scripture. Calvin's and Luther's positions on this issue are only superficially similar. The real basis is dissimilar, as is also quite clear from Müller's account. Calvin's understanding of the Law, and of the OT as a whole, was different from Luther's, and some of the distinctive characteristics of later Puritanism are related to exactly this difference, sabbatarianism included. But Calvin, it is true, was no sabbatarian. Nor did he have to be such in order to have provided the impetus for sabbatarianism.

Karlstadt is the subject of chap. 4, and it is again the issue of the Sabbath and its theology that is the focus. Müller briefly outlines Karlstadt's position as spelled out in his book *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen*, a book which Müller considers a distinct product of Karlstadt's flirt with mysticism. The reviewer could not quite be convinced by the evidence presented in favor of this point of view, but this may be due to one's definition of mysticism. Is Karlstadt's position not rather close to Calvin's? Müller would not think so. He also takes issue with Gordon Rupp, who considered Karlstadt's sabbathbook "a premonition of Puritanism." Karlstadt certainly goes further than Calvin (or rather, Calvin does not go as far as Karlstadt) in accepting the idea of one day in seven on biblical

authority. A belief long kept alive in Seventh Day Baptist and Seventh-day Adventist circles—namely, that Karlstadt was a proponent of their particular point of view—is put to rest.

In the final chapter of the first part of his volume Müller deals with the Anabaptists, the discussion centering on two proponents of seventh-day Sabbath observance, Oswald Glait and Andreas Fischer. The two are apparently the only Anabaptists known to have advocated the sacredness of the seventh day and of whose beliefs on this point some details remain. Since, however, none of their own works on the Sabbath question have survived, Müller must reconstruct their Sabbath theology on the basis of polemical tracts directed against them, on the basis, basically, of tracts by Schwenckfeld and Crautwald. In summarizing his findings, Müller brings together the various lines advanced in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath under the heading of motifs and theological presuppositions. Six are listed, constituent parts of all subsequent discussions on the subject. One notices with interest a distinct eschatological orientation, a rather significant aspect of all subsequent discussions in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath.

Part 2 of the book concentrates on the seventeenth-century English sources. Müller puts the Sabbath theology of the Seventh Day Baptists in the context of Puritan sabbatarianism, which is contrasted with “antisabbatarian” theology, or basically the position of Luther as held by the Anglicans. A number of possible reasons for the development of Puritan sabbatarianism are given, among them the Marian exile and the subsequent strong reformed influence in England. Müller notes especially the influence of Calvin—a point somewhat at odds with his earlier statement that there was no relation between Calvin’s “Sunday” and the Puritan Sabbath. Nevertheless, there was a further development in England, for, as Müller goes on to show, the Puritans accepted the decalogue (including the fourth commandment) as the eternal will of God. With regard to the “sabbath” they held not just the concept that time is required for worship (Calvin), nor just the idea that one day in seven (any day) ought to be observed (Karlstadt), but rather believed that one particular day ought to be observed: Sunday. Sunday was invested by the Puritans with all the authority of the original seventh-day Sabbath of the OT, and they assumed, unlike the continental reformers, that Sunday had apostolic sanction, even a divine mandate—the theoretical basis of Puritan sabbatarianism.

On the heels of the sabbatarian controversy between Puritans and Anglicans over the manner of observance and scriptural authority follows another over the particular day, one especially associated with Seventh Day Baptism. What is the relationship of Seventh Day Baptism to Puritanism and to Anglicanism? Müller suggests that Seventh Day Baptism is an

outgrowth of the conflict between Puritans and "antisabbarians," a movement that provided a third alternative (p. 169). But this kind of historical triangle is misleading. Has Müller perhaps confused movement with ideology? Müller's basic concern is not with the origin of Seventh Day Baptism, but with the cause of seventh-day Sabbath theology in England in the seventeenth century. Müller has looked for a link to the continent and admits he has not come across one. So he looks at the English scene and sees a possible explanation in the Puritan-Anglican controversy. There must be a connection, but it is not that of cause to effect. Moreover, the continental link is hardly necessary, though should one be found it would broaden our understanding of the historical development of the Sabbath doctrine. The Sabbath theology of the Seventh Day Baptists, however, can be quite well explained by hermeneutical factors operating within Puritanism itself; in fact, the Sabbath theology of the Seventh Day Baptists, one might almost say, was a necessary consequence of theological developments within Puritanism.

Part 3 of the volume is concerned with nineteenth-century developments in America, with the origin of the Adventist Sabbath theology. Müller points out that Seventh Day Baptists were active within the Millerite movement, where their views on the question of the Sabbath were not unknown. Their importance for the development of Adventist Sabbath theology is well known. Müller passes it over in relatively few words and then goes on to examine the early literature of the sabbatarian Adventists (later Seventh-day Adventists). In so doing he confines himself primarily to the literature of the first few years of the movement (to the tracts of T. M. Preble and Joseph Bates, and to articles in the early Adventist periodicals), but goes beyond this period in the case of J. N. Andrews's *History of the Sabbath*, as also in the case of the writings of E. G. White. The latter's views on the Sabbath are chosen for their representative nature of Adventist Sabbath theology, and they are summed up under the heading of different motifs (creation, covenant, law, restoration and salvation motifs). A final paragraph deals with White's views on the observance of the Sabbath.

The subject of this third part of the volume is undoubtedly the most familiar to readers and presents little that is new. However, on the basis of the research reported in Parts 1 and 2, Müller is able to state that there is little in the Sabbath theology of Seventh-day Adventists that is original in principle—not even that of relating the Sabbath question to that of the heavenly sanctuary (p. 5 and p. 200, n. 53).

Müller's work is a serious study and will be of interest to both theologians and historians. It may give rise to some debate, though more likely it will stimulate further research on this significant topic. That such

further research will be done must also be the author's own anticipation, for he concludes his study with a number of suggestions for further research, and the list is undoubtedly not meant to be exhaustive.

The particular merit of the study, in this writer's view, is the attempt to relate the Sabbath question to broader issues, to hermeneutical issues. The Sabbath question is very much a hermeneutical question and in a Christian context very closely related to the question of the OT and its place in the canon. It is to Müller's credit that he has attempted to look at the problem in this enlarged perspective.

Reading, England

PALLE J. OLSEN

Thiele, Edwin R. *Knowing God*. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1979. 127 pp. Paperback, \$4.95.

Edwin R. Thiele is internationally known to OT scholarship for his books and articles on the chronology of the kings of Judah and Israel during the Divided Monarchy, and his reconstruction of that chronology has justly been referred to by Siegfried H. Horn as a "breakthrough" (see *AUSS* 5 [1967]: 213). But Thiele's many years of pastoral, editorial, and teaching experience have given him, as well, the burden and insights to write materials of a more popular and devotional type, the book here under review being an outstanding example. A worthy addition to Southern Publishing Association's Horizon Series, it reveals the author's phenomenal mastery of biblical materials, while at the same time making its presentation in a popular and heart-warming style.

This book focuses on the center of all biblical theology: God. With a virtually compendious notice of both OT and NT materials, supplemented by comments based on the author's own perceptive analysis, the volume carries us through such topics as "The Eternal God," "The Supreme Ruler of the Universe," "The Triune God," "God Becomes Man," "God Is Love," "The Saviour God," "Our Father in Heaven," and a number of others (there are thirteen short chapters in all).

In his Introduction, Thiele posits that "leaders in any field—in industry, finance, religion, or commerce—must know God if they would, with insight and foresight, guide others in accord with what is best for all concerned" and that "society acquires its shape by what men know, or do not know, about God and how they respond to His influence upon the human heart." He indicates that the book "will explore the question of how children of men can become transformed into children of God, and what steps they may take that will make them wiser and better, more like