group of theologians who have played significant roles in theological studies has been included. Definitions are frequently paired together when there is a similarity of usage, e.g., “a posteriori” and “a priori.”

The *Pocket Dictionary* is described by the authors as “a reference book” (5). It has been especially geared toward beginning students of theology and pastors. One use suggested by the authors is that of a “crib sheet” to aid in preparation for definition-oriented exams (6). I believe the *Pocket Dictionary* meets its intended goals, and I would recommend it as an additional textbook for beginning theological students, as well as a useful tool for pastors.

Berrien Springs, Michigan  
KAREN K. ABRAHAMSON


Michael G. Hasel’s *Domination and Resistance*, the published version of his University of Arizona doctoral dissertation, sets out to investigate the correlation between the archaeological, textual, and iconographic records of Egypt’s nineteenth dynasty’s dominance over Canaan (7). To conduct this investigation, Hasel has divided his study into four sections.

Chapter 1 is primarily composed of studies of war terminology used by Egypt’s nineteenth dynasty pharaohs. As a prelude to the lexical study, Hasel provides a brief overview of Egyptian historiography and kingship, concluding that the material he surveys “served the purpose of communicating their intended message to both literate and illiterate during the New Kingdom, giving them a sense of the military prowess of their king, his victory over foreign lands, and ultimately his protection of Egypt” (21). While the lexical section focuses on the nineteenth dynasty, examples are included from other dynasties of the New Kingdom and beyond.

Chapter 2 shifts the discussion to a comparison between the claimed military actions against Canaan by the nineteenth-dynasty pharaohs and the archaeological evidence of those Canaanite sites. Hasel begins the chapter with a survey of Egyptian architectural features discovered in Canaan. These include: “‘Governors’ Residencies,” “Forts on the ‘Ways of Horus,’” “Temples,” and “Naval Bases.” Thereafter, an assortment of Egyptian materials found in Canaan is discussed. The second part of chapter 2 details the military claims of the nineteenth-dynasty pharaohs as they relate to Canaanite archaeological sites. Such discussion requires Hasel to deal with issues such as the length of pharaohs’ reigns, and claims of conquest.

The third section of Hasel’s work concentrates on ethnic and cultural concerns. In this chapter he primarily discusses Israel and the Shasu.

Chapter 4 is used by Hasel to collect the conclusions that have arisen in the previous three chapters into seminal hypotheses. In the end, he produces a paradigm of Egyptian military activity in the nineteenth dynasty.

One of the more interesting conclusions of chapter 1 is that the Egyptian scribes were “stereotypical” in their reporting and, while implying a full
destruction of conquered cities and peoples, the Egyptian iconographic evidence does not support such claims. Cities described as “plundered” are pictured with only moderate damage. Indeed, according to Hasel, most of the nineteenth dynasty’s military actions succeeded in maintaining control of Canaanite cities, thus, continuing to receive their goods, not to destroy cities and thereby lose the lucrative booty (87-90).

Hasel’s investigations reveal how difficult it is to locate ancient sites and identify Egyptian conquest evidence once the sites have been identified. For example, the destruction evidence at sites like Pella (129, 167), Akko (132, 169), Hazor (145), Kadesh (159), and Dhiban (164), which are mentioned in nineteenth-dynasty Egyptian campaign records, are difficult to assign to any specific activities, Egyptian or otherwise. On the other hand, archaeological sites like Beth ‘Anath (132, 170, 171), Gaza (137), Hammath (138), and Yeno’am (147) are only partially excavated, or their excavation reports are as yet unpublished. This causes Hasel to conclude about Ramses II: “The archaeological evidence for the Late Bronze Age in Transjordan is difficult to interpret in terms of sedentary occupation and the continuity of city inhabitation. The campaigns of Ramses II in the majority of cases cannot be adequately tested due to the lack of excavations” (175). His conclusions about Ramses and Transjordan are not too far removed from the evidence he presents for the other pharaohs of the nineteenth dynasty and Cisjordan (for example, see his comments about Seti I,150). In the case of Merenptah, only Gezer provides “significant evidence” to relate its destruction to this pharaoh, while other sites need further investigation (189). As Hasel concludes, “Archaeological interpretation on the basis of the evidence available is not yet able to determine with certainty the identification of a destruction level with any specific entity” (190). In the end Hasel finds the nineteenth-dynasty pharaohs’ claims of destroying cities contrary to the Egyptian iconographic evidence and the military aims of those pharaohs. His conclusions should certainly be a warning to those who want to force on the biblical stories a higher standard of verifiability than is possible for nineteenth-dynasty Egypt. Perhaps archaeology itself needs to be reevaluated in order to more clearly understand its limits.

For many readers the purchase of Hasel’s book will be worth his discussion of social/ethnic entities, Israel and the Shasu. Hasel has done an excellent job of sorting out the evidence to reach the conclusion that the term Shasu was often used as a geographical term, for a place which was located by the nineteenth-dynasty Egyptians in southern Transjordan (biblical Seir/Edom, 225, 230-232).

Somewhat more controversial will be Hasel’s discussion of the Merenptah’s Stela and Israel. Hasel provides a compelling case for Israel as a socioethnic, non-city bound, agrarian society (232). Hasel that in chapter 2 he has demonstrated within the context of the nineteenth and twentieth dynasties that prt has the literal meaning of “seed” (i.e., “grain,” 201, 202). While I agree with Hasel’s conclusion that “Israel is laid waste ( لكل), its grain (prt) is not,” is a synonymous parallelism that describes the desolation of Israel’s grain,” I believe the evidence is not so conclusive as Hasel argues (79). First, prt does appear on occasion without a complete determinative grain. Second, in a few places it does have the meaning of descendants. Third, in the Merenptah stela the determinative used with prt does
not make any conclusion definitive (cf. 77-80), but is ambiguous.

Despite this quibbling, Hasel has written a well-crafted book that will have an impact on a wider sphere of research than Egyptian military history. The book should be read by every scholar interested in the geopolitical issues of the ancient Levant. Hasel sets a standard of quality of research and grasp of issues that will influence Egyptian and biblical studies for several generations.

Andrews University

David Merling

---


Lawyer Phillip E. Johnson of the University of California, Berkeley, has become a well-known writer in the creation-vs.-evolution debate since his first edition of *Darwin on Trial* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991), an excellent exposition of the case against Darwinism. He has contributed numerous articles to *Christianity Today* and other journals in addition to two more books, *Reason in the Balance: The Case against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education* (InterVarsity, 1995) and *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds* (InterVarsity, 1997), on identifying faulty logic in discussions of origins. The title of the present volume again reflects his legal perspective; the subtitle highlights his undisguised goal of overthrowing Darwinism as a key belief in our culture. His writings challenge both atheistic and theistic evolutionists.

The book jacket shows a smiling Johnson holding balances representing justice in his right hand and a Neanderthal skull presumably representing evolution in his left, portraying an opposition between justice and evolutionism in our culture. His main point is that objections to evolutionism have not been overruled, yet Darwinism not only still dominates the realms of science and education, but also reaches increasingly into law and culture, threatening to limit our very freedom of thought. Nevertheless, because “naturalism” (i.e., excluding all supernatural influences), of which materialistic evolutionism is but a logical deduction, is a worldview which conflicts with reality because things beyond the material really do exist, Johnson believes that Darwinism will soon be generally rejected. He predicts the exposure of scientific materialism as an absurdity, and expects a revolution of our culture’s worldview within the coming decade.

A majority of the twenty-two essays which comprise this volume are reviews of recent books, often comparing two notable works—for example, Michael Behe’s *Darwin’s Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* and Richard Dawkins’ *Climbing Mount Improbable*, or comparing *Science Wars*, a special edition of the postmodernist social text, with John Horgan’s *The End of Science: Facing the Limits of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age*. Johnson’s penetrating analysis of each author’s perceptions brings the reader abreast of much current popular—and unpopular—thinking in the scientific arena.

His essays, insightful and bold, are mostly short, lucidly worded and well arranged. He has divided the book into two parts, the first focusing on the way Darwinists defend Darwinism, the second on the growing influence of evolutionary naturalism in law and culture. In part 1 he begins with historical