Chapter 14 cautions the reader that “doing” theology is a difficult task that puts us “in over our heads.” This is because we have “partial” and “transitional” insights. It is, therefore, “freeing and honest to admit we are embodying the folly of God’s wisdom to use such earthen vessels to do kingdom work.”

The contents of this book are provocative. Seminary and university professors, theologians, biblical exegetes, and missiologists are recommended to reflect on its message; but the reading should only be a prelude to interdisciplinary discussions. There are some minor editorial problems, with some inconsistency in referencing: some chapters have end notes and others footnotes, but this does not diminish from the quality of the overall writing.
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A scholar once remarked that it is hard to write anything new about the book of Daniel. Aaron B. Hebbard, who earned his Ph.D. from the University of Glasgow, and who currently teaches theology and arts at Community Christian College in Southern California, attempts to do just that by approaching the book of Daniel in a fresh and even unique way. His thesis in Reading Daniel as a Text in Theological Hermeneutics is that the book’s central figure, Daniel, stands as the paradigm of the good theological interpreter.

A unique feature of Hebbard’s approach is that he sees the book of Daniel as a narrative textbook: “The Narrator is the pedagogue, the reader is the student, and Daniel is the master teacher” (33). As such, he organizes his approach to the study of the book of Daniel as if he is teaching undergraduate and graduate courses on theological hermeneutics. The first three chapters of Reading Daniel are introductory. Chapters 4 and 5 form the core of the work, with chapter 4 focusing on the hermeneutics behind the stories found in Daniel (undergraduate course on hermeneutics) and chapter 5 studying the hermeneutics and praxis that underlie Daniel’s visions (graduate course on hermeneutics). The author’s concern is primarily on contemporary readers and their communities of faith, though this concern does not downplay the results of past and present scholarship on Daniel. In fact, the book has references to the standard works on both hermeneutics and Daniel.

For Hebbard, theological hermeneutics and the process of interpretation are not simply academic or intellectual exercises; above all, they are theological endeavors (36). This means that interpretation cannot be divorced from one’s relationship to Adonai. He rightly comments that, in the book of Daniel, acquisition of pure wisdom is a matter of life and death. Wisdom is tied to righteousness, and this is why its antonyms are “wickedness” and “evil.”
Today, the community of the faithful experiences the tension between the past and the present, between memory and hope. Since the book of Daniel is emphatically eschatological, the reader can claim its glorious promises and have a hopeful look into the future.

Hebbard’s approach to the historicity of Daniel and his book is governed by his theological hermeneutics. Although higher-critical scholarship of the nineteenth century denied Daniel’s authorship, later research and archaeological discoveries have led some scholars to conclude that the historicity of Daniel and the traditional authorship of his book should be taken more seriously. Hebbard, however, claims that his aim, against higher criticism, is not to dehistoricize Daniel’s book, but to provide “the historical continuum” for the contemporary reader who is “a member of the grandiose Danielic readerly community” (8). He seeks to accomplish this by making a careful distinction between historical criticism, which asks questions that are external to the text, and literary criticism, which asks questions about the internal workings of the text. He claims that his approach begins with the text (i.e., a literary approach) since he lets the internal evidence speak for itself. He warns that often in the study of biblical texts important agendas may blind interpreters. Second, he shies away from what he calls the “enormity of historical-critical debates” by choosing to classify Daniel as “historical fiction.” The reader is left wondering why the author is trying to avoid one extreme by going to the other.

Coincidentally, in a book published in the same year as Hebbard’s, Thomas Gaston (Historical Issues in the Book of Daniel [Oxford: Taanath Shiloh, 2009]) presents solid evidence in favor of the historicity of Daniel. Gaston states that Daniel’s prophetic synopsis is entirely accurate for the level of detail it includes, and he broadens and applies this conviction to the whole book of Daniel. He concludes that there are strong reasons to believe that the stories about Daniel and his contemporaries are rooted in historical events and centered on real individuals. Gaston rightly argues that to rob Daniel’s visions and prophecies of their authority is to rob them of their purpose because a fictional prophet cannot utter factual prophecy. Historicity of biblical events and persons cannot be separated from the practical issues of faith that affect the lives of believers and the ways in which they relate to God and his revelation.

There are some minor omissions and inaccuracies in Reading Daniel. For example, no mention is made of the fact that in the OT wisdom books only the Creator God dispenses wisdom. On page 136, Belshazzar is quoted as telling Daniel: “I have heard that the spirit of the holy gods is in you.” In the actual speech by this king, the important adjective “holy” is missing (Dan 5:14). This is in contrast to the use of the same word in the speeches by Nebuchadnezzar and the queen mother.

In conclusion, Hebbard’s work is an important step in the ongoing study of the book of Daniel. The book is well written and documented and its
insistence on theological hermeneutics is especially commendable. Although I take a very different approach to the historicity of Daniel, I recommend Reading Daniel to anyone interested in the field of multidisciplinary approaches to the text of the Bible, especially in Daniel.

Walla Walla University
College Place, Washington
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Parochialism, Pluralism, and Contextualization is the final volume of a series of three books containing, primarily, papers originally presented at the symposium on religious minorities and the enforcement of conformity in post-Reformation Europe, held at Newbold College, Bracknell, England, in September 1999. The first two volumes appeared in 2006 and 2007 (Richard Bonney and David J. B. Trim, eds., Persecution and Pluralism: Calvinists and Religious Minorities in Early Modern Europe, 1550-1700, Studies in the History of Religious and Political Pluralism, vol. 2 [Oxford: Peter Lang, 2006]; and idem, The Development of Pluralism in Modern Britain and France, Studies in the History of Religious and Political Pluralism, vol. 1 [Bern: Peter Lang, 2007]). The third volume was edited by Daniel Heinz, director of the European Archives of Seventh-day Adventist History and professor of church history at Friedensau Adventist University (Germany), and David J. B. Trim, who at the time of the publication of the book was a lecturer in history and associate director of the Centre for the Study of Religious and Cultural Diversity at Newbold College (England). Although the three volumes focus on different denominational traditions and geographic territories, they all share the common theme of pluralism. The third volume focuses specifically on the history and mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Europe.

An introductory overview on the various articles by Trim (9-29) and a brief epilogue as a conclusion by Heinz (207-208) provide a framework for the articles. The first five articles, following Trim’s introduction, describe and analyze the historical situation in Central Europe and Great Britain in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (31-91). Harry H. Leonard outlined in his article the development from the Millerite movement in the 1840s to the organization of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in 1863, including the early Adventist missionary rationale, the events that led to John Nevins Andrews being sent as a missionary to Europe, and the enormous growth of the denomination until the early 2000s (31-50). His statements that W. Miller never accepted the investigative judgment per se and that J. White “did