

through ancient Biblical manuscripts." And they might be right, for there are far too many cultural and historical parallels in Old World writings and the Book of Mormon which hadn't found the light of day when Joseph Smith translated the book. If Joseph Smith had only formed a new church—that is plausible; but to write the Book of Mormon unaided—that is impossible: there is too much *Zusammenhang* for there to be any other explanation than the one Joseph Smith has given us.

Physically, there are several problems with Hullinger's book. If it were the book Reverend Walters describes it to be, it would have been published by a well-known publisher. As it is, a vanity press has put together an expensive paperback on cheap paper, using a type face which is difficult to read, and leaving a multitude of typographical errors in both the text and footnotes. The book uses flush-right chapter and section headings, which are also confusing and inconsistent. Moreover, the "Index of References" is not the usual index with page numbers referring to the text, but a list of scriptures ostensibly calculated to impress, not to inform. However, the subject index is good, and the bibliography seems thorough. (But who would quote E.D. Howe's book these days?)

The novelty of *Mormon Answer to Skepticism* is its thesis that Joseph Smith was deliberately writing the Book of Mormon to uphold and defend Christianity from rationalists and deists, and in doing so,

he has been fair-minded. The best example he gives of his fairness is found in Appendix I where is discussed Ethan Smith's *View of the Hebrews*:

The question is, did he use *View of the Hebrews* in producing the Book of Mormon? The possibility is there and the probability is strong that he did. Nevertheless, the case is circumstantial until evidence is found that ties *View of the Hebrews* to Joseph Smith before he produced the Book of Mormon.

Hullinger's entire scenario, then, is built on circumstantial evidence. Yet he has succeeded unwittingly in re-affirming for me and other readers why the Church of Jesus Christ was restored in 1830 to quench the people's thirst for the gospel. If Hullinger could only trust a Mormon source whose findings could be verified, he would discover that the Larsen-Rencher wordprint study of the Book of Mormon, done by impartial computers, showed odds of 10 billion to 1 against single authorship and odds of 1 billion to 1 against Joseph Smith (reported in *BYU Studies*, Spring 1980).

There are yet many unanswered questions and puzzling lacunae in Mormon history, and Pastor Hullinger has done Mormonism a favor by bringing his fresh insights and findings to light. The challenge is clear for both Mormon and non-Mormon scholars of Joseph Smith and the church he left behind.

Torah! Torah! Torah!

The Glory of God is Intelligence: Four Lectures on the Role of Intellect in Judaism. By Jacob Neusner. With Introduction by S. Kent Brown. Provo: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1978, xxi + 68 pp, \$4.95.

Reviewed by RICHARD D. HECHT, Professor of Religious Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara.

This is a *Festschrift* of four lectures given by Jacob Neusner at Brigham Young University in 1977: "The Glory of God is Intelligence: A Theology of Torah-learning in Judaism," "Cultic Piety and Pharisaism Before 70," "From Cultic Piety to Torah Piety After 70," and "The Mishnah as a Focus of Torah Piety." It also contains a bibliography of Neusner's major publications.

The importance of this volume resides at two levels. First, Professor Neusner's introductory lecture sets forth the distinctive idea of *Talmud-Torah*: man serves God through the use of the mind. In his admirable introduction, Kent Brown reminds the reader of the centrality of learning as devotion to God from the earliest period of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Although Neusner subtitled the first lecture "A Theology of Torah-learning in Judaism," its implications extend beyond the confines of one religious community, presenting a striking dialogue between two very different communities which hold human thought and reflection to be of the highest spiritual value. Neusner demonstrates in this first lecture that Judaism's demands upon the mind for reason, criticism, restraint and the rational exchange of ideas, witnessed on every page of Talmud, are not limited to some closed and remote period of antiquity. Neusner states, "The Jew has been taught to engage realistically in the world's tasks, to do so with a whole heart, yet without the need or even the power, to regard completion of those tasks as the threshold of a final and completed fulfillment of history. Because of its mode of thinking, Judaism teaches man to take seriously the wide range of worldly problems without expecting that in solving them—provisionally, let alone finally—they might save the world."

At a second level, the three following lectures—beginning with the question of when in the history of Judaism did the idea of Torah-learning enter the theological complex of Judaism—serve as a most concise guide, to Neusner's more extensive and specialized studies over the past fifteen years. Are the Pharisees to be characterized as a sect devoted to the preservation and mastery of Torah-traditions before 70 A.D. and the destruction of the temple? Neusner summarizes what can be said of the Pharisees from the historical documents (allusions to the Pharisees in Josephus, controversies between the Pharisees and Jesus from the Gospels and laws and sayings attributed to the Pharisees or stories told of this group by the rabbis from the period after 70 A.D., preserved in the Mishnah, To-

sefta and later texts). The Pharisees, in Neusner's analysis, appear as a group centering upon table-fellowship and as "Jews who believed that the purity laws were to be kept outside of the Temple" Other sectors of the Judaeen population organized their lives around the restriction of purity laws to the precincts of the Temple. The Pharisees' meals appear distinctive from the early Christian community's specific and intense ritual meal. Neusner states that the pharisaic table-fellowship was a "quite ordinary, everyday affair. The various fellowship rules had to be observed in wholly routine daily circumstances, without accompanying rites other than a benediction for the food. The Christians' myths and rituals rendered table-fellowship into a much heightened spiritual experience: 'Do this in memory of me.' " Neusner concludes that before 70 A.D. *Talmud-Torah* was not a central idea of Judaism.

In the third lecture, Neusner indicates the precise manner in which *Talmud-Torah* became one element within the symbolic structure of Judaism, along with the study of Torah, the rabbi and the importance of moral and ethical action, forming a coherent unity in the wake of the Temple's destruction. This transpired through the amalgamation of the pharisaic ideal of Israel as a nation of priests and the scribal tradition of learning or study as a way of life. Before the events of 70 A.D., the Pharisees had extended the Temple's sanctity and purity to the ordinary, but it was after that period and when all hopes for the rebuilding of the Temple came to an end with the Bar Kokhba revolt (132–135 A.D.) that, as Neusner indicates, "the rabbi is the new priest. Study of Torah is the new cult. Deeds of loving-kindness are the new sacrifice."

The fourth lecture is the most important for general students of religion. Here, Neusner explores the Mishnah as the single most important document in the religious world-view of Rabbinic Judaism. While he treats the manner in which transcendence is made contemporary in Mishnah and how Mishnah by its very ontological structure facilitates memorization, the most important ele-