

Palestine, his final chapter on Israelite material culture, and, scattered throughout the book, his discussions of terminology. The latter item is especially helpful for beginning students, since archaeological terms have different meanings, depending on the scholars who are using them (e.g., Middle Bronze I equals Early Bronze IV for some scholars but is the same as Middle Bronze IIA for others). The historical background given for each archaeological period is also useful. Sources used are authoritative and up-to-date. Citations are as recent as 1988—not bad for a book published in 1990.

The illustrations are generally of good quality, numerous, and conveniently located throughout, rather than grouped together in plates in the center or at the end of the book. The tables correlating contemporary strata from different sites will also be helpful to the beginner. The only negative reaction this reviewer had was to the distracting, pasted-on look of the map labels. Overall, this book is probably the best general work on the archaeology of Palestine currently produced and will provide a first-rate introduction for the beginner and serve as an excellent reference for the scholar.

Andrews University

RANDALL W. YOUNKER

Mazzaferri, Frederick David. *The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source-Critical Perspective*. BZNW, vol. 54. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1989. xix + 486 pp. \$102.00.

Frederick Mazzaferri's contribution to the discussion regarding the genre of the Apocalypse is based on a dissertation produced under the guidance of Ruth Edwards at the University of Aberdeen. After a survey of introductory issues (chaps. 1 and 2), he reviews the literature on the subject of genre within biblical criticism (chap. 3). He then defines the genres of classical prophecy and "apocalyptic," Christian prophecy and "neo-apocalyptic" (chaps. 4-8). The last half of the book evaluates Revelation on the basis of his definitions of prophetic and apocalyptic genre. Mazzaferri argues that Revelation is not an apocalyptic book but is a "proximate classical prophecy" that is modeled on the classical prophets of the OT, particularly Ezekiel.

The book's most critical assumption is that the author of Revelation at times employs sources with "generic intent" (pp. v, 58, 379, *passim*)—in other words, as a pointer to his self-understanding of the kind of book being written. If one can define the genre of documents used in such "generic" fashion, one can determine the genre intended by the author. Mazzaferri believes that John never uses apocalyptic sources "with generic intent" but often does so when quoting prophetic sources, Ezekiel in particular. John thus identifies himself with the classical prophets rather than with the apocalyptic writers.

A number of problems arise, however, on the way to Mazzaferri's conclusion. Since "generic intent" or purpose on the part of the author of Revelation is so critical to his thesis, one would expect a clear definition of generic intent and a clear outline of the criteria and procedures by which one can determine whether an author is using a source generically or not. But neither is produced. The closest one comes is on p. 58, where John's "generic purpose" in the use of OT sources is evidenced by the quantity of such use and the assertion that John often "mimics classical Hebrew." But these two characteristics in themselves are not unique to prophetic literature.

Since Mazzaferri attempts to break new literary ground, a survey of the principles of "generic criticism" as applied to English or European literature would have provided assistance in making his case for Revelation. However, not a single such literary-critical work is cited in either footnotes or bibliography. Thus, Mazzaferri is operating not on clearly defined and accepted principles of literary and generic criticism but on assumptions regarding John's generic self-understanding. But even if one grants that John understood himself to be in the line of the classical prophets, it does not settle the issue of genre. The genre of Revelation may have been far more influenced by contemporary usage of the OT than John himself was aware of. Furthermore, it remains to be demonstrated that John had a clear understanding of what "genre" is all about in the modern sense. Statements such as "John offers no hint whatever that he accepts any apocalyptic concept with generic intent" (p. 256) are probably anachronistic.

A further issue is whether Mazzaferri has correctly understood the significance of genre within the current debate. However, since that problem has been thoroughly dealt with by John J. Collins' review of Mazzaferri in the *Critical Review of Books in Religion: 1990*, it need not be dealt with here. Due to such misunderstandings and to the significant differences between Revelation and the prophets which Mazzaferri has either overlooked or underplayed, it is doubtful that scholarship on the Apocalypse will consider his work to have settled the issue of the genre of Revelation. The evidence remains problematic, but it is to be hoped that Mazzaferri's work will stimulate further refinement on both sides of the issue.

A number of strengths in the book should be noted. Mazzaferri is at his best when working directly with the biblical text. He calls attention to a number of significant literary features of the classical prophets which find parallels in Revelation. Even more helpful is Mazzaferri's exegetical work on Revelation, particularly on chaps. 5, 10, and 11. Although the implications he draws for his central thesis are often questionable, his observations stimulate the reader to see various associations in the book in a fresh light. Mazzaferri has also provided extremely helpful indexes to key words, subjects, and quotations from biblical and other ancient literary sources. Since the book is filled with multitudes of cross-references, the indexes are essential in order to get an organized grasp of most of the exegetical arguments.

Besides problems in the central thesis of the book, a major irritation is the author's cavalier attitude toward the labors and opinions of those whose views disagree with his. He confidently and decisively settles such issues as the structure of Revelation and the OT text tradition of its author without offering persuasive evidence that he has grasped the complexities involved. Most unfortunate and unnecessary is a blistering eight-page attack on the rough draft of an unpublished work by A. J. Ferch written for a nonscholarly audience, causing one to wonder about the motives behind the whole enterprise. If the overt humility of the foreword had been continued in the body of the text, the book might not strike one as negatively as it does.

In conclusion, this is a book that offers many rewards to the serious student of Revelation, but one whose author is not consistently fair either with the text of Revelation or with those whose writings preceded his.

Andrews University

JON PAULIEN

Oliver, Barry David. *SDA Organizational Structure: Past, Present, and Future*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 15. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1989. xii + 433 pp. Paperback, \$16.95.

This is the second recently published dissertation on the development of Seventh-day Adventist church polity. Barry Oliver builds on Andrew Mustard's exposition of the initial stage of Adventist organization, which extended from 1844 through 1881 (reviewed in *AUSS* 28 [Spring 1990]: 99-100).

Oliver first describes the historical developments related to Adventist organization between 1888 and 1903. He then analyzes the theological premises that characterized the conflicting views of A. T. Jones and A. G. Daniells and their allies in 1901 and 1903.

Jones, E. J. Waggoner, and others (including W. W. Prescott until 1901) constructed their ecclesiology from the starting point of individual salvation, righteousness by faith, the priesthood of believers, and the sole headship of Christ (pp. 220-223). By 1901 they taught a strongly individualistic and congregational view of church organization. Waggoner came eventually to the conclusion that when the church reached spiritual maturity all human organization would "be left aside as the toys of childhood" (pp. 234-236).

Oliver describes this view as Christocentric and applauds its emphasis on what the church *is* over what the church *does*. It was one-sided, however, in its "failure to recognize that the church is not wholly, nor only, a theological entity," but also a "sociological entity" (p. 239).