commended for including both secular and religious non-Western historical perspectives in the larger picture. His emphasis on women, minorities, and forgotten parts of the world is evident.

Unfortunately, Tuttle's criteria in selecting representative figures for each historical period are not always obvious when one thinks about possible candidates. Why Abraham and not Noah? Why Hannah and not Elisha? Further, some of Tuttle's information seems to belong to tradition and hagiography rather than to documented historical facts.

The Story of Evangelism tends to remain at a general/popular level, without going into the depth of the scholarly debates and arguments related to such an important aspect of Christian history. I recommend the book as a perspective opener for beginning students of evangelism history.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

Cristian Dumitrescu


Peter T. Vogt, Associate Professor of Old Testament at Bethel Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, produced Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of Torah, a monograph based on his doctoral dissertation, which was written for the University of Gloucestershire under the supervision of J. Gordon McConville. In his opening chapter, Vogt summarizes the prevailing scholarly consensus regarding the revolutionary theology of Deuteronomy: that it is characterized by demythologization, centralization, and secularization. He also critiques this consensus view, providing an amicable but devastating expose of its weaknesses (including logical fallacies, methodological flaws, and inadequate argumentation), which calls for an alternative interpretation of Deuteronomic theology. In succeeding chapters, Vogt analyzes major sections of Deuteronomy that have formed the basis for the prevailing scholarly consensus: Deut 1:9-18 (chap. 2), 4:1–6:9 (chap. 3), 12 (chap. 4), and 16:18–18:22 (chap. 5). He concludes that Deuteronomic theology is revolutionary, but its revolutionary nature is of a very different kind than that proposed in the prevailing scholarly understanding: "It is in its deliberate rejection of ANE models of kingship and institutional permanence, its emphasis on the holiness of all life lived out before Yahweh, and its elevation of the supremacy of Yahweh and his Torah that Deuteronomy reveals itself to be a truly revolutionary text" (6).

Vogt shows that Deuteronomy does not demythologize—does not move from an earlier crude, anthropomorphic view of God as needing a dwelling place on earth to a more spiritual, abstract theological view in which God no longer actually dwells on earth. Rather, according to Deuteronomic theology, God's presence is both in heaven and on earth (in battle, at Mt. Horeb, at the future chosen place). Vogt brilliantly demonstrates that in the Deuteronomic revolutionary program this divine presence is particularly actualized and experienced by Israel through keeping the instructions of Torah.

According to Vogt, Deuteronomic theology also does not envision the secularization of judicial procedure, the Sabbath and annual festivals, and other Israelite institutions, as the prevailing scholarly view suggests. He points out that such distinction between the sacred and the secular is a modern construct and not part of ancient worldviews. Deuteronomy does not secularize, but rather emphasizes the holiness of all life lived out in the presence of YHWH. The Sabbath commandment in Deut 5 does not add a new, secular, social/humanitarian motivation for observing the seventh day,
but emphasizes this aspect of Sabbath that complements the motivation of creation found in Exod 20 and that was already present in Exod 23:12. Vogt provides a penetrating analysis of Deut 5:1-6:9, concluding that "Through the blending of generations and the emphasis upon teaching the words of Yahweh, this section seeks to demonstrate that Torah remains the foundation for every generation of the people of Yahweh" (159).

Deuteronomistic theology, according to Vogt, does centralize sacrifice, but not worship. Furthermore, "In contrast to the centralized power structures of ANE monarchies, Deuteronomy provides for a system in which powers are distributed and in which the people in assembly have a genuine, responsible role to play" (227). The radical Deuteronomistic vision "is remarkably egalitarian" (229). Instead of advancing the role and power of the centralized monarchy, as many scholars suggest, "Deuteronomy is radical precisely in its rejection of models of administration that have at their center an all-powerful king" (231). It is YHWH who is central and supreme in Deuteronomistic theology, and his Torah provides the means by which Yahweh's supremacy is to be lived out by his people.

Although Vogt does not directly address formal questions of introduction (date, authorship, Sitz im Leben) with regard to the book of Deuteronomy, he vigorously engages with scholars on the level of critical assumptions regarding documentary sources (JEDP), and in the end his critique lends support for a basic unity in the text of Deuteronomy, and a life-setting at the time of Israel's transition from wilderness wandering to settlement in the Promised Land. Careful attention is given to the three main scholarly approaches toward the structure of the final form of Deuteronomy—superscriptions (markers used to introduce Moses' speeches), covenant/treaty form (paralleling the ANE suzerainty treaties), and literary concentricity (ABCB'A' pattern). Vogt shows how each of these approaches has in common an emphasis upon the supremacy of YHWH and the crucial importance of Torah, which suggests that these themes may indeed be regarded as central in the theology of Deuteronomy as a whole.

I am convinced that Vogt's basic thesis and the major contours of his argumentation are sound. In my view, there are, however, a few areas where his presentation might have been strengthened. First, although Vogt does pay some attention to the covenant/treaty structural features in the book, he views the suzerainty covenant/treaty as "a sub-structure of the book, not the primary structure" (27). By minimizing the importance of the suzerainty covenant/treaty structure and giving it only passing attention in his analysis, Vogt has not been able to develop the powerful theological implications emerging from this structure, especially the reality of grace (the historical prologue) that precedes law (the covenant stipulations) and provides the motivation of gratitude in the hearts of the worshipers to obey Torah.

Second, while rightly castigating other scholars for their tendency "to equate noncorporeality and invisibility with absence" (122), Vogt does not escape his own critique when he equates divine invisibility with noncorporeality (132, 135). Deuteronomy 4 states that no divine "form" was seen by the people, but this does not necessarily imply (as Vogt seems to suggest) that the deity has no form (cf., e.g., Exod 33:20-23; John 5:37). Third, in discussing the priority of worship in the structure of Deut 12-26 (197-200), Vogt does not give enough attention to the work of Steven Kaufman, who, in my view, has convincingly shown that this section of the book treats successively each of the ten commandments.

Fourth, although Vogt rightly recognizes the emphasis in Deuteronomy upon
reverence for life implicit in the instructions for “reverent slaughter” (202) of animals in Deut 12, I think he could have gone even further in noting here the language of divine concession, with an implicit divine preference for total abstinence from nonsacrificial slaughter of animals. Finally, Vogt’s discussion of the nature of “righteousness” (Heb. tsedeq) in the OT focuses almost entirely upon the definition of tsedeq as “conformity to a norm,” and does not indicate the existence of the ongoing debate in OT scholarship over the meaning of this word and the insistence of many scholars that tsedeq must be defined in terms of personal relationship and not conformity to a norm.

Aside from these few minor suggestions for improvement of the work, I commend Vogt for his penetrating analysis of Deuteronomy, which provides a needed corrective to the scholarly consensus and presents in bold relief the core concerns of Deuteronomic theology—the supremacy of YHWH and the central and continuing role of Torah in the life of the covenant community.

Andrews University

RICHARD M. DAVIDSON


In his book The End of Memory, Miroslav Volf continues his extended theological engagement with central Christian themes of grace, forgiveness, and reconciliation. The syntax of this wider theological framework, lucidly articulated in his earlier works Exclusion or Embrace? and Free of Charge, is here skillfully wielded in dealing with the issue of memories of wrongdoing suffered. Volf, in constructing his argument, deftly engages a wide range of interlocutors, with Elie Wiesel’s reflections on the saving character of remembering arguably assuming the center stage. One should note from the outset that the book title conveys a word play that in many ways summarizes the central theme of this fine work. First, we are concerned with the end of memory in the sense of its telos, its purpose. In other words, we ask why it is that we need to remember at all, and what it is that constitutes rightful remembering. Second, the question is raised whether there is any moral justifiability in envisioning the end of memory in terms of an ultimate or penultimate terminus, as in forgetting and letting go.

In examining the textured nature of human remembering, Volf makes it clear that memories in themselves are “dangerously underdetermined” (34). They have the potential to “restore health and dignity, protect, and prompt the pursuit of justice” (39), but also to fuel deep-seated resentments and impede personal well-being. That is why it is incumbent on us to remember rightly, which, for Volf, means foremost to remember truthfully. This is an essential step in dealing with memories of wrongdoing suffered, as “truthfulness is a form of justice and an indispensable precondition for reconciliation” (59). Such truthful recollection is also indispensable for inner healing, as only truthful memories “give access to the event with which peace needs to be made” (75). The search for peace, however, does not belie the fact that some memories of wrong suffered are essentially irredeemable and thereby resistant to meaningful incorporation into narrative self-construction.

While Volf never tires in underscoring the decisive praxial component of remembering, inviting us to acts of solidarity and struggle for justice, he is equally insistent in cautioning against conducting such struggles in an unjust way. Such exigency for proper balancing is ostensibly based on the regulative ideas of the Exodus and Passion narratives that are, in turn, mediated through the formal aspects of identity, community, future, and God. Three things clearly emerge from Volf’s delineation of the