

Matthew and Luke have corrected the Markan grammar. Rather, one should study style as choice. This concept helps one to perceive the cohesion of the text and its uniqueness. "The notion of 'correct' Greek has no basis in the language itself," he argues (97).

In the second section of *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation*, the articles wrestle with the following issues: interaction of text, cotext, and context in the parable of the two debtors; *ὄν, δέ, καί*, and asyndeton in the Gospel of John; imperativals (participles, adjectives, infinitives, and imperatives) in Rom 12; the disappearing *δέ* in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians; thematic development in 1 Cor 5; dimensions of discourse structure (symmetric structure, semantic structure, and syntactic structure) in Paul's Epistle to the Galatians; the function of *καί* in the NT and in 2 Peter; exegesis of 1 John based on discourse analysis; and discourse analysis and Jewish apocalyptic in Jude.

The articles differ somewhat in style: Some use footnotes; others have references within the text. Some add an extensive bibliography, while others have only a few or not even one bibliographical entry. The complicated plots and charts require computer technology for research. Some might ask whether the results justify the effort to do such meticulous study—although the present reviewer would answer this question affirmatively. Furthermore, how do some of the methods work with longer documents? In some cases, one would expect to get a more elaborate definition of unfamiliar key terms and a precise explanation of how to employ one or the other technique of discourse analysis. What bothers one most, however, is that commonly used linguistic terms are frequently redefined. One could wish that linguistics could settle on a standard vocabulary that would not differ with each scholar (see on p. 214 the term "semantic structure" as used by Rogers, Beekman, and Parunak).

Although this monograph is not easy reading, it rewards the one who takes the effort to digest it. It provides new vistas, opening the eyes to new methodologies for investigating the NT text and—at the same time—remaining faithful to it. *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation* is recommended for scholars interested in fresh approaches to the biblical text. It provides a helpful summary of discourse analysis, not only for the beginning student, but also for the one who has already some expertise in this field of study.

Berringen, Germany

EKKEHART MÜLLER

Davies, Philip R. *In Search of 'Ancient Israel.'* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series, no. 148. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992. 172 pp. \$22.50.

In a provocative book written for students rather than fellow biblical scholars, Philip R. Davies, Reader in Biblical Studies at the University of Sheffield, engages in a quest for the identity of "ancient Israel."

The first chapter describes three different types of Israel, including "biblical Israel," which is the Israel portrayed in the Biblical narratives;

“historical Israel,” the Israel that is known through archaeology and extrabiblical research; and “ancient Israel” as a modern scholarly construct which emerges when both reconstructed biblical and archaeological data are combined. It is this “ancient Israel” that Davies claims is ever elusive. Relying heavily on the work of Thomas L. Thompson, *The Early History of the Israelite People: The Literary and Archaeological Evidence* (1992), Davies claims in chapter 2 that the “historical Israel” is not well represented in the archaeological record. Furthermore, “ancient Israel” is a scholarly invention based on combining biblical and literary reconstructions which are then presented as “historical.” Davies criticizes biblical scholars for their use of the historical-critical method, which he argues is based on circular reasoning, citing several examples.

In chapter 3 the author investigates “biblical Israel,” which he maintains is “a diverse, confusing and even contradictory notion” (49) that can be dismissed as a starting point for historical investigation.

Chapter 4 returns to the “historical Israel” in much more detail. Davies begins with an overview of the evidence for the name “Israel” by referring to the Merneptah Stela (ca. 1207 BC). He concedes that this “Israel” is located somewhere in Palestine and points to the dispute over whether the designation “Israel” refers to a people or a territory. He recognizes that there was probably an Israelite state beginning in the mid-11th century B.C., but regards as highly implausible that this “Israel” ever broke away from Judah. Claiming prematurely that King David is not present in archaeological or literary sources, Davies actually concludes that the conquest narratives of Joshua and Judges, the David and Saul narratives, and the accounts of the two kingdoms are all fictional (70).

Davies suggests in chapter 5 that the composition of all OT literature took place during the postexilic Persian and Hellenistic periods. The archaeological material from this period is, he claims, even more meager than for the Iron Age.

Chapter 6 discusses the origin of the Hebrew language as a *Bildungssprache* (following E. A. Knauf) that did not emerge until the disappearance of the Judean state. Ignoring much evidence to the contrary, Davies maintains that there are no linguistic arguments to date the biblical literature to the ninth or eighth centuries B.C. rather than to the fifth. He sees all biblical literature to have been composed “between the sixth and third centuries B.C.” (105).

Chapter 7 claims that biblical literature was composed by upper-class scribes of the palace and temple who thereby sought to legitimize Israel by creating a national identity. It was not until the second century B.C. under the Hasmonaeans that the Judaeen state “flowered momentarily” (155). Thus emerged what he calls “biblical Israel.”

While Davies’ writing is clear, his hypothesis has major problems. He does not adequately cite literature from the angle of biblical studies and philology or from archaeology. In suggesting that the biblical tradition was primarily a product of postexilic scribal activity Davies virtually ignores the recent commentaries on the book of Amos by Freedman and Andersen and Shalom Paul, which seem to demonstrate an eighth-century date for this book (see also John H. Hayes on Amos). Furthermore, archaeological evidence for the

earthquake mentioned in Amos 1:1 has been uncovered as recently as 1990 by William G. Dever (see *Eretz-Israel* [1992]). Others, including Philip King, have pointed to earthquake correlations on the basis of destruction levels in Hazor, which in turn suggest correlations between the biblical text and archaeological finds. Numerous other examples could be cited which support the biblical record and cast doubt on the supposed disparity between scripture and history. Davies makes no mention of any of these recent directions in modern scholarship.

In fact, Davies views with pessimism all the archaeological evidence. Yet field archaeology and extrabiblical texts have produced an abundance of information that cannot be ignored. Perhaps the final blow to Davies' polemic rests here. The recent discovery of the Tel Dan inscription mentions for the first time in an extrabiblical text (dated to the mid-ninth century B.C.) both the "House of David" and the "King of Israel" (A. Biran and J. Naveh, "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan," *IEJ* 43 [1993] 81-98). This text shows that both the "House of David" and the "King of Israel" were in existence during the mid-ninth century B.C.

Although *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'* was written before the discovery of the Tel Dan inscription find, the inscription may serve as a caution against the kind of rash and one-sided scholarship represented in this volume. It is only through correlation of both textual (biblical and extrabiblical) and archaeological lines of evidence that a more accurate picture of early Israel can emerge. This picture will represent not a "scholarly construct" but rather a genuine understanding of ancient Israel based on all the sources at our disposal.

Tucson, Arizona 85716

MICHAEL G. HASEL

Dick, Everett Newfon. *William Miller and the Advent Crisis*. Edited with a Foreword and Historiographical Essay by Gary Land. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1994. xxvii + 221 pp. \$16.99.

*William Miller and the Advent Crisis* is Everett Dick's revision of his 1930 University of Wisconsin Ph.D. dissertation, which was the first scholarly historical investigation of the Millerite movement. In 1932 Dick submitted the manuscript for publication in a series of books for Seventh-day Adventist ministers, but L. E. Froom, ministerial director and editor of *Ministry*, rejected it and later convinced administrators at Union College (Lincoln, Nebraska) not to publish it at the college press. After a third rejection by another denominational publishing house, Dick shelved the project and went on to other pursuits (Land's foreword, vii).

Everett N. Dick (1898-1989) taught history at Union College from 1930 until shortly before his death almost sixty years later, winning wide acclaim as a historian of the American frontier. His publications included *The Sod-House Frontier* (1937), *Vanguards of the Frontier* (1941), *The Dixie Frontier* (1948), *Tales of the Frontier* (1964), *Union, College of the Golden Cords* (1967), *The Lure of the*