

should have provided a consistent model for the discussion of other compound verb roots.) Nonspecialists will normally, however, find the *Exegetical Dictionary* easier to use than BAG.

Perhaps 75-80 percent of the entries are unsigned, in which case they were prepared by the two editors. These unsigned entries are limited to an indication of gender and declension in the case of nouns, or a boldfaced number denoting how many sets of endings in the case of adjectives, followed by transliteration, a short definition or two in English, and often a short paragraph of explanation. If the discussion cites every occurrence of the word in the NT, the definition is followed by an asterisk. The bulk of the entries are made up of signed articles, ranging in length from a couple paragraphs to nearly a hundred. The articles were written by over 100 scholars from ten countries, although the use of the German language in the original no doubt necessitated that the overwhelming majority be from Germany, with a half-dozen each from Switzerland and Austria. The volume is intentionally ecumenical in its use of both Protestant and Catholic contributors.

The textual base of the *Dictionary* is the 26th Edition of Nestle-Aland, but variants are taken into consideration whenever a given author considers them significant.

Although no comment is made on principles of translation or editing, some sense of the procedure can be obtained with a little effort in comparison. Unlike Colin Brown's major revisions of the *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, the changes from the German original of Balz and Schneider (*Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*) are minimal. The translation could be described as "dynamic" in the sense that it attempts to capture the intent of the original while abandoning the complexity of German syntax. The result is an English dictionary that is as clear and easy to understand as if it had been freshly written in English. In most cases the translation proceeds line by line with the original; the occasional editorial rearrangements do not add or subtract significantly from the content. At times an English work will be added to a bibliography or a German work deleted. All in all, a fine English work has resulted with a minimum of additional effort.

Although the print is rather small in places, it is clear and easy to read. I am aware of no typographical errors in the sections that I sampled. Some pages of my working copy fell out almost immediately, however. Since the volumes are fairly expensive, the publisher must not allow such defects to continue. The set, when completed, should provide a popular and handy first reference for students of the NT. Scholars who desire a more thorough treatment of a NT word will continue to peruse its predecessors.

Andrews University

JON PAULIEN

Dever, William G. *Recent Archaeological Discoveries and Biblical Research*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1990. x + 189 pp. \$17.50.

The setting of Dever's book is a series of lectures delivered in April 1985 as part of the "Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies," University

of Washington. Its theme is found in chap. 1, where Dever attempts to define the relationship between archaeology and the Bible. Dever suggests that the Bible is an artifact "curated" by a priestly minority who did not write an objective or complete history, but rather, preserved what was beneficial to their agenda. For Dever, questions regarding the "truth" of the biblical stories are beyond archaeology. Archaeology can speak to the material culture, comment on specific texts, and provide missing or alternate interpretations. No historical science can, however, prove or disprove the "spiritual" relevance of the Bible.

According to Dever, Syro-Palestine archaeology was largely waylaid until the late 1960s by American biblical scholars who, reacting to European textual and historical hypercriticism, saw archaeology as a means of "proving the Bible," or, at the least, centered their archaeological investigations on biblical questions. In the 1960s the first large numbers of secular students arrived on the Syro-Palestinian archaeological scene. These students were motivated primarily by anthropologic rather than religious interests. This development, says Dever, has broadened and strengthened Syro-Palestinian archaeology.

In chaps. 2-4 Dever illustrates biblical subjects that he thinks are illuminated by archaeology ("The Israelite Settlement," "Monumental Art and Architecture in Ancient Israel," "The Lost Background of the Israelite Cult"). Each of these chapters is illustrated with line drawings and charts. Chap. 4, "The Lost Background of the Israelite Cult," is especially helpful. Dever displays available archaeological evidence of the religious practices of the Israelite commoner. Readers are brought face-to-face with a religious syncretism at which the Bible only hints.

Dever's voice is a most important one in the discussion of the relationship between archaeology and the Bible. He has been repeatedly maligned or misunderstood (e.g., *BAR*, May/June 1981, pp. 54-57; "On Abandoning the Term Biblical Archaeology," *BAR*, September/October 1981, p. 12) because he dared to challenge the use or misuse of the term "Biblical Archaeology," although Dever himself uses the term (p. 26). Among other things, his critics have dismissed his arguments as "mere semantics."

What Dever challenges is not the use of the term "Biblical Archaeology," but rather an uncritical acceptance of the previously existing relationship between archaeology and the Bible. In other words, he contends, if both the Bible and archaeology are to be taken seriously, each must stand on its own merits before the two can be effectively brought together.

A novice to archaeology might read into Dever's book the incorrect assumption that scholarly opinions are unified on topics such as the Israelite settlement. Due to the complexity of interpreting the archaeological data (added to problems such as the sparsity of published final reports, the uneven excavation skills of archaeologists, and the relatively small amount of data collected from each site), interpretations are varied. Dever's work, however, is an excellent source of current and, perhaps, majority opinion.

Dever should be commended for clearly setting forth what he sees is the relationship between archaeology and the Bible before he brings the two

together. Not that this will be the last word on the subject, because archaeological evidence will increase and biblical interpretations will sharpen. The relationship between archaeology and the Bible will always be open to debate. *Recent Archaeological Discoveries* should cause all contemporary scholars to reexamine how they associate archaeology with the Bible.

Andrews University

DAVID MERLING

Knight, George R. *Angry Saints: Tensions and Possibilities in the Adventist Struggle Over Righteousness by Faith*. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1989. 158 pp. \$12.95.

Of the making of books on the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference session of 1888 there seems to be no end. George R. Knight's volume is the latest in a line whose authors include A. G. Daniells, Meade MacGuire, L. E. Froom, Taylor G. Bunch, L. H. Christian, M. L. Andreasen, Robert J. Wieland, and Donald K. Short, each with his own agenda. Like the others, Knight's purpose is to draw lessons from the past for Adventists today. His previous book, *From 1888 to Apostasy: The Case of A. T. Jones*, had a biographical focus; in this volume he seeks to balance this by treating more specifically the theological issues highlighted at that 1888 conference.

Like a sprinter in a 100-yard dash, the followers of William Miller gave their utmost for their eschatology, believing that Jesus' second advent would occur in October 1844. Since they were already Christians, they took their soteriology for granted and thus gave little special thought to the first coming of Christ.

Forty-four years later in Minneapolis, Minnesota, A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner, two young editors from the west coast, proclaimed a message of "righteousness by faith" that most of the Seventh-day Adventist church had tended to neglect. To the older leaders of the church—such as G. I. Butler, General Conference president, and Uriah Smith, long-time editor of the *Advent Review* and author of the respected *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*—this message sounded like dangerous new theology that would change the shape of the Adventist church.

The precipitating issues which angered the saints in 1888 were trivial enough: the list of tribes predicted by the ten horns of Dan 7 and the nature of that law which was our "schoolmaster," according to Gal 3:24-25. Jones declared that the tenth horn of Dan 7 pointed to the Allemanni, whereas Uriah Smith held that the application was to the Huns. Waggoner claimed that the "schoolmaster" law in Galatians meant the moral as well as the ceremonial law, while Smith and Butler insisted that only the ceremonial law could be intended. These issues, however, were merely entering points into the real concern.

Reviewing these disputes, Knight organizes his book around four crises. These relate, respectively, to understanding, personality, spirit, and authority.

In regard to the first crisis, Knight sees two understandings of soteriology. Both sides in the controversy said that they believed in righteousness by