Newport does (199), that it was the SDA interpretation of the second beast of Rev 13 as the United States that was the catalyst for the events at Waco is to subtly imply that all SDAs would fundamentally fall into the same camp and may be similarly a risk to society. This is irresponsible, no matter how respectable the motive. It takes no cognizance of the fact that SDAs have no anti-US sentiments, are taught to be loyal to the established authorities, are pacifists opposed to the use of arms, are taught not to do anything to provoke a time of trouble before the time, and are taught that even when a state passes laws that violate the conscience believers should not fight against the state but should seek out remote places of refuge where they can worship God freely according to the dictates of conscience. There is no theology akin to that of Koresh and the Branch Davidians. With his SDA background, Newport should know this, but perhaps he exaggerates in an effort to make his point.

Newport's book has an interesting line of thought, but it needs to be read critically, not with a gullible mind. He has not himself, in the book, critically evaluated the historicist method of interpreting Daniel and the Revelation. He has evaluated it in the light of some non-critical issues which he perceives to be negative results of historicist interpretation, particularly anti-Catholicism, disappointed Millerite eschatological expectation, and a disaster at Waco, and he has found it wanting. But these things in themselves cannot be used as a critical basis for rejecting the method. The method should be justified or invalidated from within the text, and this requires careful critical study of the text. This book belongs properly to socio-religious studies, not to biblical studies, as Newport himself would no doubt readily agree.

Edwin Reynolds

Wallace, Ronald S. *On the Interpretation and Use of the Bible.* Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1999; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999. 137 pp.

Roland S. Wallace is retired from teaching at Columbia Theological Seminary in Decatur, Georgia. He is the author of numerous books, including *Readings in 1 & 2 Kings*, *The Message of Daniel*, and *Calvin, Geneva, and the Reformation.* He confesses at several points that his experiences with the Bible helped him form the ways in which he understands it. He deals with presuppositions in regard to inspiration, revelation, and salvation history. He stresses the unity of the OT and NT in the light that the OT was a preparation for the NT. His emphasis on the unchanging value of the OT text is apropos when the use of the NT is prominent in the church.

Wallace sees with insight the importance of Gen 1-11 as a theological prelude to the Bible. My difficulty lies in that he sees them as mere "stories" (36). It is disconcerting to observe that, while he does not believe in miracles, he believes in

the Incarnation (119). His modernist view of things makes it difficult for him to accept anything that is not scientifically objective. In spite of his difficulty accepting records of supernatural miracles as facts, he does emphasize, later in his book, his acceptance of the "miracles" of forgiveness and reconciliation (122-23).

Wallace recognizes two factors in the approach to interpretation, namely, the need "to take full account of the human origin of all the texts that make it [the Bible] up" and the need "to take into account the frequency of the signature attached to many of its most important oracles: 'Thus says the Lord'" (43). He believes that the interpretation of the text within the worshiping community is to be guided by a number of factors such as pastoral concern and care, pastoral intercourse, and the voice of the laity.

Wallace believes that the process of interpretation should include not only the analysis and explanation of the text but also listening to the text (63). He uses the word "criticism" positively and understands it to mean "an effort to bring out the merits of a [literary] work" (64). Commentaries written during the last two centuries using a grammatico-historical approach, Wallace says, referring to the historical-critical method, are there "to explain what the words and sentences of the text mean as they occur and lie in their context" (65). He advocates the use of allegorical interpretation due to some limitations of the grammatico-historical approach. He believes that allegorical interpretation makes the text relevant to life. It is also true, however, pace Wallace, that frequent use of allegorical interpretation tends to lessen the importance of the original messages contained in the Bible.

Although Calvin is the theologian for Wallace, he cannot accept Calvin's idea of predestination, that God elected "some to damnation" and "some to salvation" (117). In his favor, however, Calvin tried not only to bring out the grammatical and historical sense of the passage but to take "full account of the word that was to be 'heard' and 'seen' within the contemporary Church" (68). Wallace provides an excellent explanation as to why the idea of *sensus plenior* is necessary, although this might open a floodgate for eisegesis. Somehow this approach has prepared the readers for a post-modernist reading. He contends that "'ever new richness of unsuspected meaning' can be unfolded as the tradition of the community expands" (68). New contexts will bring readers into discovery of the meaning which was not "even discernible when it was originally written" (69). He believes that new meaning is of much more importance than the original meaning. His theological approach is using a theology "which we ourselves in our own experience have found to arise out of, and have tested against the widest possible range of Biblical writing" (71).

For Wallace, the Decalogue was not "meant to be regarded as setting out the demand of a universal and absolute law for all nations, but as a revelation of the new and liberating kind of life which they were now to enjoy and witness to as his own people" (80). This view is contradictory to the *sensus plenior* approach he proposes. I believe that the Decalogue should be meaningful both for the Israelites and for the Christians of later generations if the Bible should have relevance for

our lives. It should be a universal law for all nations in order to be relevant and because it is the moral law for people's hearts. Of course, as Wallace maintains, it was "when Jesus Christ came that he revealed in all its fullness the gracious meaning of the commandments as they were originally given" (80-81).

His statement that some portions of the Bible are not inspired is problematic (8). For him, anything that lacks spiritual usefulness is not inspired. By stressing the interdependence of both inspired and uninspired parts of Scripture, however, he tries to avoid possible criticism. His omission of 'salvation history' in describing his experiences is regrettable. I believe it is in this idea that the Bible is made more relevant for our lives. In spite of all these insightful ideas the presence of many typos and inappropriate punctuation marks is disappointing.

Wallace's discussions on the unity of the OT and NT and on typology impressed me most. His explanation of and emphasis on the unity of the two Testaments was apt and excellent. His discussion of typology was also appropriate. Preachers can find this book full of good insights for their sermon making. For those whose background knowledge of interpretive methods is poor, this book can cause confusion. A careful reading of this book will be helpful.

Hyunsok Doh