This concern for tawhid frequently carries over into the new Christian consciousness as Muslim Background Believers practice the same conservative conformity in their new faith orientation. In other words, the faith may change, but the lifestyle may not. Often, the rejection of the Muslim lifestyle leaves an emotional vacuum. Open conversion creates serious difficulties with existing family and Muslim friends as the old lifestyle is maintained in parallel with a newer lifestyle.

That this concern for tawhid carries over into the community is to be expected. “Rejection of Islam is taken by many Middle Easterners to be a rejection of the Muslim community . . . a key contributing factor to the problems faced (by many)” (50). For this reason, one of the most difficult aspects of Muslim-Christian conversion is the lack of ummah (“community”) and the suspicion and distrust converts face from Christian Background Believers. This problem cannot be overestimated.

Chapter 5 raises an issue familiar to the reviewer, himself a Christian convert. The new believer expects to be brought into a community of saints in which all are expected to be loving, patient, and almost perfect. At the very least, there should be a strong sense of unity, almost to the point of conformity. For Muslim Background Believers, however, the sinful disharmony of believers is a serious letdown. Interestingly, while the Muslim ummah may have serious cracks and divisions (e.g., Sunni and Shiite), until recently these existed without being consciously noticed.

The author moves on, in chapters 7 and 8, to address issues pertinent to missionaries working among Arab-speaking Muslims such as building a new community in a new faith setting, how new believers can and do relate to their families and the larger community, and levels of acceptable deviance. She details several levels of change and the frequent urge of new converts for extreme separation from their past faith and lifestyle.

I wish there would have been more coverage of Insider Movements in the book; however, these are rarer in the Middle East than elsewhere and frequently difficult to detect or to make contact with. Nevertheless, in spite of these problems, Insider Movements can provide an answer to many of the difficulties attached to open change. This book is recommended for academics and missionaries working among Muslims or preparing others to do so. Sociologists will enjoy the new setting for familiar themes.
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Dios defiende a su pueblo consists of 12 chapters, 22 tables and charts, a glossary of theological terms, and a selected bibliography. Mora offers a detailed commentary of Daniel 10–12 that, according to William H. Shea, “represents a significant and often misunderstood part of the book of Daniel” (back cover). Shea’s analysis is correct—Mora pays attention to every detail in the Hebrew, illuminating its meaning through literary structures and emphasizing key words of the biblical text, thereby setting the exegetical process on a solid foundation.

In the first chapter, the author takes time to establish his methodology by providing and reviewing the principles with which the prophecy is to be interpreted.

In the second chapter, he discusses the historical and literary context of Daniel 10–12 with the help of various charts and diagrams, and in the next chapter he comments on Daniel’s text from 10:1–11:2.

Chapters 4-12 are dedicated to a verse-by-verse commentary on the chapters under study, based largely on a variety of exegetical commentaries—especially of Seventh-day Adventist scholars—that maintain the historicist method and denying any futuristic interpretation on the periods of Daniel 12 (208-230, see esp. 227-230). Among Adventists with futurist tendencies, see Marian G. Berry (Warning! [1990]), Robert N. Smith Jr. (Sunday versus Rapture [2002]), Victor Michaelson (Delayed: Time-setting Heresies Exposed [1989]), Kenneth Cox (Daniel: A Closer Look at the Book That Tells What Will Happen in the End Times [2005]), and Samuel Nuñez (Las profecías apocalípticas de Daniel: La verdad acerca del futuro de la humanidad [2006]).

In addition, for each of the chapters in which the biblical text is analyzed, Mora presents subdivisions, organizing them as follows: (1) paragraph structure, followed by a free translation, which is more literal than dynamic; (2) commentary on the application of the prophetic section to human history in general and to today’s world and to the life of the contemporary believer (i.e., spiritual reflection) in particular (xii).

same power that appears in Daniel 7–8, i.e., the “little horn” identified as the papal power. Verses 11:21-22a offer five characteristics “that allow identifying this vile one as the papal power” (106). However, importantly he identifies the “prince of the covenant” (Dan 11:22) as the Roman Empire (110).

Silitonga further contends that

whenever Daniel 11 refers to the covenant with a religious connotation, that covenant is specific and consistently referred to as “holy covenant” (11:28, 30). The other kind of alliance is simply a “covenant” (11:22, 32), and literally refers to an “unholy pact.” The expression “prince of the covenant” may well be associated with a “confederate prince” of Genesis 14:13. In the context of Daniel 11, however, it is the king of the north (Silitonga, 109).

Mora does not agree with Silitonga that the “prince of the covenant,” “Messiah, the Prince” is Christ since this position would prod him to understand the “vile person” as Tiberius Caesar or another Roman emperor—something that is not in harmony with the presented evidence regarding 11:21 (104-111). Rather, he uses Doukhan’s position as foundational. Doukhan, contra Silitonga, suggests that the “prince of the covenant” refers to the “people of a prince” and not the “Messiah, the Prince” in Dan 9:25 (Secrets of Daniel [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 2000], 145-146).

However, most conservative Adventist scholars believe that the “prince of the covenant” recorded in Daniel is Christ. For example, Shea mentions that there are at least three linguistic connections between Dan 9:25-27 and 11:21 that lead him to conclude that the “prince of the covenant” is the “Messiah, Prince” of Daniel 9 (Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretion [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1982], 48). In a similar vein, Merling Alomía notes that “prince of the covenant” is the real linguistic basis linking the prophecies of Daniel 9 and 11, because nobody else made the eternal covenant, but the Messiah, and He did it while dying, as the lamb who was killed when the covenant was “cut.” This undeniable reality makes totally null any other interpretation that doesn’t see Jesus . . . as the One and only and absolute fulfillment of both 9:24–27 and 11:22 (Daniel: El profeta mesiánico, 2d ed. [Lima, Peru: Universidad Peruana Unión, 2008], 2:414).

Although Mora offers nothing new about Daniel 10–12, he should be commended. His work, as Elias Brasil de Souza says, is “a detailed and balanced commentary” since it makes an adequate use of the available exegetical evidence and “interacts extensively with leading Adventist scholars” who have commented on the book by Daniel.

Unfortunately, until the author prepares an English version, only those who can read in Spanish will be blessed with this important work. Whoever wants to know how the prophecies of the book of Daniel are interpreted within Adventism, especially regarding the last three chapters, cannot ignore this fascinating and detailed work.