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however, because the multifaceted nature of the history is taken seriously; the different lines of development all stand alongside one another in their own right. Likewise, some detail mistakes (e.g., the emperor donation money that Adventists received for mission purposes does not imply that Catholics recognized Adventists—distribution was made for Protestants separately [77]; the language of the Pare is not “Mamba” but Chasu [51]) should not be taken too seriously in light of the overall contribution that the study makes. The only place where the reader might wish a different approach is in a few cases where detailed interpretations appear a bit overstated. Whether the “founders of the denomination did not construct in any way a closed system of beliefs” (213) is debatable; on their newly found “pillars,” they were very much united. Conradi certainly had an ironic attitude toward other Protestant missions, but calling this “close cooperation” (223) is somewhat exaggerated. The view that Adventists had the tendency of dissolving instances of biblical dialectic such as justification and sanctification rationally and one-sidedly (607) is probably true for some Adventists but not necessarily for the mainstream.

Still, with its careful account of Adventists’ actions in the Nazi context and the first systematic interpretation of the logic behind them, this book represents the finest scholarship regarding the history of twentieth-century Christianity, a lasting contribution to Adventist studies, and an example of a sympathetic, yet critical, historiographic approach to Adventism that is worthy of imitation. Thus, all students of Adventism and those interested in twentieth-century church history will find the book enlightening.

Theologische Hochschule Friedensau
Friedensau, Germany

**STEFAN HOSCHELE**


Johannes Hartlapp is a professor of church history, philosophy, ecumenics, and history of religions in Friedensau Adventist University, Germany. The current work constitutes his slightly revised and adapted doctoral dissertation that he submitted to the Faculty of Theology at the Martin Luther University at Halle-Wittenberg, Germany, in 2007. He has dealt with the matter already in a major research paper at Friedensau Seminary in 1979 (162 pp.), and in his M.A. thesis at Andrews University in 1992 (170 pp.), and in a dozen articles in periodicals and professional journals.

In his study of the history of German Adventism the author focuses especially on the questions of Sabbath observance, the expectation of Christ’s Second Advent, the way Adventists coped with the delayed *parousia*, and the relation of these points to the exclusive claim of the denomination (19). Chapter 1 describes the beginnings of Adventism in the German
Empire and the tense relationships with governmental authorities and other denominations (1864–1914). Chapter 2 addresses the military participation in World War I, the resulting disunity in the church, the development of the Reform Movement, and the fruitless reconciliation meeting after the war (1914–1920). The enthusiastic period of the Weimar Republic (1920–1932), with Adventists striving for public acknowledgment is portrayed in chapter 3; various developments—new critics, great political events in the mid-1920s, the planned calendar reform, as well as questions regarding E. G. White and the sanctuary doctrine—are presented that had an impact on the next period. Chapter 4, constituting the heart of the book (240 pp.), describes the difficult time under the Nazi regime (1933–1945). The denomination was prohibited (November/December 1933), and after it was permitted again it assimilated, and with increasing isolation and restrictions tried to do almost everything to avoid another prohibition and possible persecution. Hence, in this wake it compromised various ethical values and foundational beliefs. In chapter 5, the relationship to the General Conference is described and how the German church leadership dealt with its own past (1945–1950s). Chapter 6 concentrates specifically on the focus points mentioned above, and draws conclusions about the why of both the Adventist Third Reich experience and the inability to face the past.

Hartlapp finds that since Adventists in their interpretation of the eschatological prophecies concentrated primarily on the activities of the Roman Catholic Church, they overlooked the anti-Christian features of National Socialism, which did not even exist in their prophetic framework (474, 581). Yet, while they assumed that God uses prophecy to show specific historical fulfillments that are of significance for God's people throughout the ages, the author of the book starts from the premise that there are various interpretational levels in the symbolic language of the prophets (606). Thus, although one may disagree with his basic premise in regard to prophecy, German Adventists admittedly had difficulties in applying the ethical values of Christ to the Nazi ideology. Here, a separate section on the treatment of Jewish citizens and church members—brief references are interspersed in the book (347, 415, 584-591)—might have provided a better disclosure of that aspect, especially since a history of the Third Reich is unthinkable without mentioning the Shoah. Unfortunately, the book takes no account of the articles on this issue by E. T. Decker, R. Blaich, and D. Heinz in Thinking in the Shadow of Hell: The Impact of the Holocaust on Theology and Jewish-Christian Relations, ed. J. B. Doukhan (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 2002), 155-208.

It may be true that an elite and exclusive concept of the church/remnant was the primary reason why it took German Adventists sixty years for an apology (512, 513). However, such prominent figures as E. G. White promoted a rather functional understanding of the church. The ontological understanding of the church that caused German Adventists to consider Jews as being rejected by God for all time (587), to deny any mistakes of the church during the Third Reich, and to move guilt simply on individual members (512,
597), could have been caused also by such German virtues as loyalty, order, diligence, and striving for perfection, as well as by the felt need to defend themselves against charges of the Reform Movement.

The author’s view of the joint guilt of the General Conference for the mistakes of German Adventists during the Nazi period (599, 600) is not really convincing. While after World War II the German leadership lamented the lack of advice and direction from the General Conference (604), it must be noted that they declined the advice of the General Conference in 1932 to contact the German government to obtain a noncombatant status (237); that they were unable to derive practical steps from the 1923 declaration of principles (157); and that they apparently did not take notice of various articles, directives, and books on the issue of civil government and service in the army, such as F. M. Wilcox, Seventh-day Adventists in Time of War (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1936). It is questionable that W. H. Teesdale’s voice for National Socialism was so influential that the officers of the General Conference were paralyzed in their actions (512, 593). Hartlapp emphasizes that avoidance of persecution was viewed by L. H. Christian as the higher priority in his list of two principles (571, 604). However, a reader of Christian’s advice to the German workers in 1939 gets the impression that the two have at least equal importance, if the second—holding fast to God’s Word, his commandments, and the gospel—received not even more emphasis. It may be possible, after all, that North American Adventists regarded the noncombatant position as an ideal, but they did not realize that this position was not transferred to other fields in the world (562, 600). They provided principles merely expecting that others would be able to apply them in their national context.

It may be easier to classify the intensity of the General Conference’s reaction to the Reform Movement in 1920 (143) with L. R. Conradi and people who seemed to share similar views, such as W. Michael, in 1932/1933 (217), and with the German church leadership after World War I and World War II, when one realizes that the leadership of any church finds it usually more difficult to deal with schismatics than with nonschismatic heretics.

Throughout the book appear various factual and bibliographic mistakes that should be corrected in a second edition: (1) D. Heinz (Church, State, and Religious Dissent, Archives of International Adventist History, 5 [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1993], 35) in describing J. N. Andrews’s fruitless missionary efforts—temperance and health—does not mention that E. G. White had to acknowledge that her experience from North America was not applicable in Europe; thus Hartlapp’s reference to Heinz is misleading (30). (2) L. R. Conradi did not experience his conversion at the camp meeting in the summer of 1878 (35), but during his stay with an Adventist family during the early months of that year (L. R. Conradi, “God’s Opening Providences,” General Conference Bulletin, June 4, 1913, 268). (3) It is true that only a little research was done on the history of Sabbath-keeping among the Anabaptists in Central and Eastern Europe (45), but it would have been worthwhile to mention D. Liechty, Sabbatarianism in the Sixteenth Century: A Page in the History of the Radical Reformation (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1993). (4) Hartlapp concludes that L. H. Christian distorted historical facts by suggesting E. G. White had settled the military and school question while being in Europe (144). However, Christian did not say that the issues were settled; he just referred to a statement about the Sabbath that White made in 1886 while in Europe (see E. G. White, “Notes of Travel,” in Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists [Basel: Imprimerie Polyglotte, 1886], 216-218; cf. L. H. Christian, Pioneers and Builders of the Advent Cause in Europe [Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1937], 150). (5) R. S. Owen’s Review and Herald article could not have been published on June 3, 1917 (213); no issue was printed on that date. (6) When E. G. White stated that she never claimed to be a prophetess, that was not a denial of a prophetic ministry as such (215), but she was afraid of the negative reputation of people who claimed that title for what they were doing, and she pointed out that her ministry encompassed more than just the work of a prophet (E. G. White, Selected Messages [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1958], 1:34-36). (7) E. G. White made the statement, “I have had no special light on the point [the definition of šāmîd in Dan 8:9-13] presented for discussion, and I do not see the need of this discussion,” in response to the leaders in the United States in 1910 rather than to L. R. Conradi in 1898 (228) (see E. G. White, “Pamphlet 20—A Call to the Watchmen,” 1910, 5, 6). (8) Der Hausfreund was edited by “Klemis” or “Klemens” A. Offermann—both spellings were used—rather than “Karl” Offermann (254, 255, 676). (9) There was no denomination called “Antitrinitarians” in mid-nineteenth-century North America (518); it should probably refer to the New England Branch of the Christian Connexion, which maintained a semi-Arian view. (10) K. F. Mueller’s thesis that W. Miller eventually accepted Snow’s proclaimed October 22, 1844, date does not contradict Miller’s statement that he had not preached a fixed date (520). His self-testimony suggests that he adopted that date about October 6, 1844 (quoted in F. D. Nichol, The Midnight Cry [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1944], 270, 277). (11) Although J. Bates had written a letter to T. M. Preble, after reading his pamphlet on the Sabbath, he did not visit him but F. Wheeler (545). (12) L. E. Froom’s four-volume series The Prophetic Faith of Our
Fathers was published already between 1946 and 1954; the 1982 edition was merely a reprint (549). (13) H. Edson had been a member of the Methodist Church rather than the Christian Connexion (560). (14) The 1915 edition of Leben und Wirken was not the first publication that contained E. G. White’s first vision, but it was already published in Erfahrungen und Gesichte sowie Geistliche Gaben ([Hamburg: Internationale Traktat-Gesellschaft, 1899], 12-20).

It would have been helpful for readers if sometimes a connection had been made to related data. One example may suffice: After World War II, various German leaders claimed that their workers had served almost exclusively in noncombatant positions and had free Sabbaths in the Wehrmacht (491, 496). Yet, statistics from the wartime manifest that just a minor part were able to serve as medics (461). Adventist soldiers initially had free Sabbaths; later such privileges were only seldom granted (459-462).

Hartlapp’s volume represents the most comprehensive work on Seventh-day Adventism under the Nazi regime. Everyone interested in the history of Adventism in Central Europe and church and state relations in the Third Reich should consult this massive product of thorough research. The few random imperfections should not disturb the main study, and even if one would interpret some sources differently, the book shows how easily one may be willing to give up basic rights, core doctrines, and ethical values, thereby losing the very identity one tries to protect.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

DENIS KAISER


In contrast with many current offerings in the field of Greek pedagogical tools, which tend to divide basic grammar and more advanced syntax into different volumes, James A. Hewett’s New Testament Greek: A Beginning and Intermediate Grammar, newly updated from the 1986 edition, combines these components in one volume.

This new edition, revised and expanded by C. Michael Robbins and Steven R. Johnson, has altered the original work in several ways: first, the expected correction of small errors in chart data and, second, the expected corrections of spelling or modifications to formatting, making the overall layout easier on the eye and more intuitive.

More than this, however, as the new preface specifies, some material has been expanded, deleted, or moved to the appendix. For instance, the rules for accentuation, originally found in the first chapter, are now located in the appendix, as are tables and paradigms, which have been greatly expanded since the first edition. Additionally, many footnotes pointing to secondary literature have been deleted “in the interest of pedagogy” (xiv).

The first two chapters, new to the revised edition, provide basic grammatical explanations of how language works that had previously been scattered