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.
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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 Revival* 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 Allemani, 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
faith. The issue was the nature of justification. Butler and Smith held that justification applies only to sins of the past and that the believer moves out of justification into sanctification, a process wherein perfection is attained by obedience. Waggoner, on the other hand, proclaimed justification as a continuing experience, one which provides assurance throughout a life of sanctification. He believed he was simply restoring Reformation faith to a church which had never given such a faith much attention.

The crisis of personality exacerbated the crisis of theology. Ellen G. White herself supported the views of Jones and Waggoner against Butler and Smith, but she refused to settle the theological details, pleading rather for mutual love and for a new trust in Christ. Knight reminds us that older leaders normally never enjoy being corrected by younger persons and that the young are not always sufficiently humble or wise in offering their corrections.

The third crisis—that of the spirit or attitudes manifested—involves opposition to Ellen White. White supported the message of Jones and Waggoner, and years passed before the traditionalists became reconciled to her and to her support of Jones and Waggoner.

The crisis of authority found the older leaders in the church supporting their positions by quoting statements made by Ellen White some forty years earlier. She herself, however, pleaded with these leaders to go to the Bible for their evidence.

In the century since 1888, two major tracks in Adventism have appeared, according to Knight. Some members of this church view the 1888 conflict as a dismal failure, while others see it as a glorious success. The former group emphasizes the denomination’s “Adventism,” while the latter stresses its “Evangelicalism.” The backdrop to this in the 1888 context is that Butler and Smith were supporters of traditional Adventism, while Jones and Waggoner were proponents of Adventist Evangelicalism. The first group emphasizes sanctification and the second stresses justification as the means of preparing for the return of Christ.

While Knight indicates his hope that the stream of books on the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference session of 1888 will soon cease, he suggests that the issues raised will have to be discussed anew in every generation of Seventh-day Adventists. His volume will provide helpful resources for future Adventist historiography.
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