

There is one problematic case that should receive a further note: On Dan 10:15 (268, line 068:2) the apparatus of the polyglot notes “pap6Q יַבֵּן” according to DJD 3:115. However, E. Ulrich now argues that the ink traces favor, and the spacing demands, the longer reading [יַבֵּן רַבֵּן] (E. Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Book of Daniel*, vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint [Leiden: Brill, 2001], 579).

Since a synopsis of the additions (Dan 3:24-90 and 14:1-42) has been published earlier (Klaus Koch, *Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch*, AOAT 38/1-2 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1987]), they are not repeated in the present volume. However, in an appendix, the Aramaic text of the additions Dan 3:24-90 and 14:23-42 from the *Chronicle of Jerahmeel* is presented according to the edition by M. Gaster and supplied with text-critical notes. The *Polyglottensynopse* concludes with a list of abbreviations employed in its text-critical apparatus.

The *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel* is a quick reference for comparing the different versions and will be an invaluable tool for those who investigate the textual variety and text-critical issues of the book of Daniel. Although it could have profited from later publications (e.g. DJD 16 and the second edition of the Göttingen Septuagint of Daniel), the *Polyglottensynopse* will surely find its place next to the critical editions of the various versions. However, these editions remain irreplaceable for one who wants to delve deeper into the text-critical study of specific passages and the complex history of the text of Daniel.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

MARTIN PRÖBSTLE

Krahmalkov, Charles R. *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, 90. *Studia Phoenicia*, 15. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2000. 499 pp. Hardcover, \$70.00.

Charles Krahmalkov's contributions to Northwest Semitic studies, including Phoenician and Punic, span a period of over three decades. Thus, the dictionary under review and a companion volume, *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), represent the product of many years of fruitful research.

The dictionary contains the entire lexicon of Phoenician and Punic occurring in extant continuous texts, including personal names. For the sake of consistency, entries are given in Standard Phoenician spelling in the order of the West Semitic alphabet. Phoenician words are rendered in italicized transliteration. Verbs are listed with hyphens between root letters. Hollow verbs are treated as biradical. The author also includes phrases such as *lpn z* (“earlier, in the past”), and gives special attention to items that shed light on culture and religion. Each entry begins with a line having a list of selected cognates in brackets, followed by another indented line with the part of speech and a simple gloss of a word or two or a phrase. Glosses with different semantic meanings are given in separate lines, such as for verbs occurring in different stems, or nouns with more than one meaning. Each gloss is followed by a paragraph of examples, translations, and source references. Proper names are not always glossed or translated. Sometimes there are special comments, cross-references to other entries, or references to the secondary literature. Due to the small size of the corpus of Phoenician and Punic texts, the

time has not yet come for separate dictionaries of the various dialects and stages of the language. Nevertheless, the reader will find a helpful identification of the sources as Phoenician (Ph), Punic (Pu), or Neo-Punic (NPu), and sometimes even the exact geographic location (e.g., "Ph, Byblos," "Pu, Carthage").

Scholars interested in reading Phoenician or Punic texts have until now relied on R. S. Tomback, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), M.-J. Fuentes Estañol, *Vocabulario Fenicio* (Barcelona: Biblioteca Fenicia, vol. 1, 1990), and J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions* (Leiden: Brill, 1995). Although Krahmalkov does not claim to present any major breakthrough in Phoenician and Punic lexicography, his dictionary is a welcome resource tool because it brings together the most complete dictionary of Phoenician and Punic to date. Krahmalkov's significant contributions include his insightful remarks on matters pertaining to Phoenician culture and religion as well as the inclusion of words drawn from Neo-Punic inscriptions in Roman letters from Roman Tripolitania and from Punic and Neo-Punic passages in Latin letters from Plautus's *Poenulus*.

The critical observations that follow are not meant to detract from the value of this dictionary, but are offered in a spirit of deep appreciation for the author and his work. The dictionary seems to be devoid of any underlying lexicographical theory. To some extent, this is understandable. For instance, the time has not yet come to attempt a classification of words according to semantic domains, since the corpus of extant Phoenician and Punic texts is at present so limited. Nevertheless, the judicious use of some lexicographical principles would have enhanced the author's contribution. For example, although the decision to include separate entries for phrases is certainly welcome, the choice concerning which groups of words deserve separate entries as "phrases" was purely subjective. No objective lexicographical principles are ever presented for these choices. Thus, for instance, no explanation is given for why a separate entry is given for *bn bn* ("grandson"; e.g., KAI 15), but not for *bn msk ymm* ("at the age of a few days"; KAI 14.3; nor is there a gloss under *bn* for "at the age of"!). The author does not explain why *sr w'rb* ("fourteen"; KAI 14.1) does not qualify for a separate entry as a phrase. I am not arguing here for the inclusion of more entries, but simply for an objective rationale.

Similarly, since the author states that entries are given in a standardized orthography "regardless of their original spellings" (17), it is curious to find detailed separate entries for *z*, *z*' and *z*' (and Neo-Punic *s* and *st*), which are simply orthographic variants. Furthermore, although it is true that the Byblian *z* (= entry *z III*) is part of a set of demonstratives peculiar to the Byblian dialect (*z* near demonstrative, *zn'* far demonstrative), it is not clear that it is a different word from the Tyro-Sidonian *z* (= entry *z II*). In spite of the author's plausible suggestion that the latter was pronounced *'zde*, a difference in pronunciation across dialects does not constitute a lexical distinction, especially in a dictionary that otherwise lists words from many dialects spanning many centuries in a standardized orthography. Besides, the plural form *ʔ* (= entry *ʔ III*) occurs in all dialects, including both Byblian (e.g., KAI 4.3) and Standard Phoenician (e.g., KAI 12.1, KAI 14.22).

Since the dictionary does not generally discuss the secondary literature (as Hoftijzer and Jongeling have done), it cannot replace the earlier works. However,

if it were priced lower, it would have been an ideal glossary or "concise" dictionary for beginning students of Phoenician. In spite of the above criticisms, Krahmalkov must be thanked for giving us the most comprehensive dictionary of Phoenician and Punic to date. That is no small task! Philologists, historians, and students of religion are all indebted to him for this contribution.

Oakwood College
Huntsville, Alabama

TARSEE LI

Pöhler, Rolf J. *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching: A Case Study in Doctrinal Development*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2000. 380 pp. Paper, \$52.95.

Young denominations, such as the Seventh-day Adventist Church, are reluctant to admit to doctrinal change over time, preferring instead to speak of doctrinal continuity. Rolf Pöhler, professor of systematic theology at Friedensau University, Germany, argues in *Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching* that "doctrinal readjustments were not only a historical fact but constituted a theological challenge which the Seventh-day Adventist Church could not ignore" (7). His recent book is adapted from the second part of his doctoral dissertation, "Change in Seventh-day Adventist Theology: A Study of the Problem of Doctrinal Development," which he defended at Andrews University in 1995, and follows publication of the first part in a companion book, *Continuity and Change in Christian Doctrine: A Study of the Problem of Doctrinal Development* (Peter Lang, 1999).

In this book, Pöhler investigates the extent, nature, and direction of doctrinal developments that have occurred in the history of the denomination from its inception to about 1985. The first chapter presents a historical survey and analysis of some theological developments within Adventism, as well as of certain sociological factors that seem to have been involved in them. The second chapter assesses what Adventists have written regarding doctrinal continuity and change. The last chapter takes a brief look at Ellen G. White's involvement in and views on doctrinal development. The book ends with appendices of official Adventist doctrinal statements and an extensive bibliography.

Continuity and Change in Adventist Teaching displays a rich collection of historical and theological information on Adventism in which Pöhler demonstrates a good knowledge of Adventist literature and its religious roots. The footnotes are sometimes just as important and informative as the text. However, one obvious weakness is the unfortunate layout: Pöhler's book is the publication of a doctoral dissertation with confusing headings and subheadings and extremely long chapters (2 and 3). It is a scholarly work of historical theology and is not user-friendly for lay people.

In his attempt to demonstrate and assess doctrinal continuity and change within Adventism, Pöhler begins with a survey of various examples taken from Adventist beliefs. A basic methodological approach he uses is to study not only officially recognized teachings of the church (such as statements of beliefs) but also general expressions of fundamental beliefs as expressed in books and leading Adventist journals (33-34). Overall, Pöhler's examples are persuasive and prove his thesis that there has been both continuity and change in the development of Adventist teaching. However, a few of his examples are weak. Regarding the