

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  
Angwin, California

STEPHANE BEAULIEU

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