

Russian Orthodox, and Coptic); “Parallels between the New Testament Gospels and Pseudepigraphal Gospels”; “Jesus’ Parables and the Parables of the Rabbis” (more than two dozen parables of Jesus that closely parallel rabbinic parables have been identified by H. K. McArthur and R. M. Johnston); “Messianic Claimants of the First and Second Centuries”; “Index of Modern Authors, Ancient Writings and Writers”; and “Ancient Sources.” Appendix 2 is worth mentioning individually because of its “Quotations, Allusions, and Parallels to the New Testament.” The appendix is organized by NT verses in canonical order. It is superior to what one is used to in the UBS *Greek New Testament* (1994) on pages 887-901. For example, the column adjacent to 2 Tim 3:8-9 reads: “Exod 7:11, 22; Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 7:11; 1:15; Num 22:22; Tg. Ps.-J. Num 22:22; CD 5:17-19; L.A.B. 47:1; *Jannes and Jambres* (frgs.); Numenius of Apamea, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.8; Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 30.2.11.” This is undoubtedly a most helpful index.

The shortcoming of the book seems to be the underemphasis of the Greco-Roman sources compared to the details accorded to the Jewish literature. One will find a list of philosophers, poets, and statesman sometimes very succinctly mentioned. For example, “*Alciphron* (second or third century C.E.), a Sophist, was the author of *Letters*” (288). More space and larger bibliographies have been allocated for Greco-Roman authors who had a bearing on Jesus and/or early Christianity. This succinctness, however, can be explained by the fact that in the last century NT studies has received an overemphasis of Greco-Roman background material. The pendulum seems to swing in the opposite direction. Modern scholars such as Evans and Sanders seem to place greater emphasis on Semitic background material, which has its legitimacy. Another lapse to be mentioned here relates to the mentioning and commenting on *Midrash Shemuel* and *Midrash Mishle*, Amoraic Midrashic Literature (243-244), while failing to mention them in the charted list of Rabbinic Literature (216).

Overall, the serious NT student and scholar will find helpful information and useful bibliography on the whole range of noncanonical texts pertinent to biblical interpretation from the OT and NT Apocrypha to Qumran to early Rabbinic and Greco-Roman materials. This is a most valuable asset in the library of every serious exegete.

Andrews University

ERHARD GALLOS

Hoffmeier, James K., and Alan Millard, eds. *The Future of Biblical Archaeology: Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004. xviii + 385 pp. Paper, \$19.95.

*The Future of Biblical Archaeology* is the result of a conference held in August of 2001 at Trinity International University in response to what many have seen as *the* crisis in biblical archaeology. Starting in the 1970s, a discussion was begun by William Dever (*Archaeology and Biblical Studies: Retrospects and Prospects* [Seabury-Western, 1974]) over the relationship between archaeology and the Bible that indeed even challenged the appropriateness of biblical archaeology as a discipline. Its practitioners, up to that point in time, tended for the most part to be biblical scholars without formal training in field archaeology, who had a positivistic agenda that often yielded unwarranted conclusions in terms of the correlation between archaeological data and the Bible. While the discussion, which continued throughout the 1980s, was fruitful, ultimately producing better-educated practitioners and a more theoretical bent to the discipline of archaeology as practiced in the Near East, the problem of interpreting material culture in such a way that it has a possible biblical connection still remains a thorny issue. One tendency has been to ignore the problem by merely changing the name of the discipline and its publications to Syro-Palestinian or Near Eastern Archaeology and producing

descriptive works with little or no interpretation when the Bible and history are potentially involved. At the opposite end of the pendulum are the so-called minimalists, who with their postmodern literary approaches, tend to ignore, trivialize, or misuse archaeological data and downplay history altogether. While not ignoring a wider chronology (Palaeolithic through modern), the authors and editors of this volume believe that biblical archaeology as practiced today is interdisciplinary. It focuses on the times, places, material culture, and literary documents from across the Near East that relate more directly to the biblical text either as background or more directly. It is inappropriate to write an obituary for the discipline, as some would presume to do; the future for integrating archaeology and the Bible is bright indeed ( xi).

The nineteen essays in this book are divided into four sections. While not all of the authors are religiously observant, each has a positive attitude toward the Hebrew Bible and is willing to examine aspects of it in light of archaeological data from the ancient Near East (xii). Part 1, "Biblical Archaeology: The Recent Debate and Future Prospects," includes "The Biblical Archaeology versus Syro-Palestinian Archaeology Debate in Its American Institutional and Intellectual Contexts" (Z. Zevit); "Theory and Method in Biblical Archaeology" (T. W. Davis); "The Relationship between Archaeology and the Bible: Expectations and Reality" (D. Merling); "Integrating Faith, the Bible and Archaeology: A Review of the 'Andrews University Way' of Doing Archaeology" (R. W. Younker); and "The North Sinai Archaeological Project's Excavations at Tell el-Borg (Sinai): An Example of the 'New' Biblical Archaeology?" (J. K. Hoffmeier). Part 2 focuses on archaeological approaches and application with four essays including "Homer and Archaeology: Minimalists and Maximalists in Classical Context" (E. Yamauchi); "A New Working Hypothesis for the Identification of Migdol" (B. E. Scolnic); "Deconstructing and Reconstructing the United Monarchy: House of David or Tent of David (Current Trends in Iron Age Chronology)" (S. M. Ortiz); and "Amorites and Israelites: Invisible Invaders: Modern Expectation and Ancient Reality" (A. Millard). In terms of "Using Texts in Biblical Archaeology," Part 3 provides essays on "Sumer and the Bible: A Matter of Proportion" (W. W. Hallo); "Ancient Israel's Literary Heritage Compared with Hittite Textual Data" (H. A. Hoffner); "Genesis in History and Tradition: The Syrian Background of Israel's Ancestors, Reprise" (D. E. Fleming); "Multiple-Month Ritual Calendars in the West Semitic World: Emar 446 and Lev 23" (R. S. Hess); "The Repopulation of Samaria (2 Kgs 17:24, 27-31) in Light of Recent Study" (K. L. Younger); and "Methodological Issues in Reconstructing Language Systems from Epigraphic Fragments" (C. L. Miller). Part 4 emphasizes "Hermeneutics and Theology" with essays on "The Role of Context and the Promise of Archaeology in Biblical Interpretation from Early Judaism to Post Modernity" (J. M. Monson); "Ancient Near Eastern Mythography as It Relates to Historiography in the Hebrew Bible: Genesis 3 and the Cosmic Battle" (R. E. Averbeck); "Splendid Truths' or 'Prodigious Commotion'? Ancient Near Eastern Texts and the Study of the Bible" (D. B. Weisberg); and "Can We Write a History of Israel Today?" (A. G. Vaughn).

Zevit's essay sets the stage of the book and traces the debate in some detail, while Davis deals with relatively current, often dysfunctional, issues. Moving beyond the debate and its problems are essays by Merling and Younker. Merling's essay, which follows up his dissertation and related articles (*The Book of Joshua: Its Theme and Role in Archaeological Discussions*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 23 [Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1997]; and "The Book of Joshua, Parts I and II: Expectations of Archaeology," *AUSS* 39 [2001]: 61-72; 209-221), focuses on the need to move the relationship between archaeology and the Bible from its former

prove/disprove model to a coherence model that does not overstep the data on either side of the equation. He concludes that archaeology is a scattered collection of what has been found, the Bible is a scattered record of what was needed for the biblical writer's theological purposes, and that these two fluid sets of data, though being parallel and complementary/supplementary, seldom intersect in terms of specific events (42). Younker's essay presents an example of how a faith-based educational institution can successfully integrate scientific field archaeology and biblical studies. Hoffmeier's article completes the section by demonstrating how archaeology and the Bible may be used in a complementary way in identifying locations along the route of the exodus (see also James K. Hoffmeier, *Israel in Egypt* [Oxford: 1997]).

Under approaches and application, Yamauchi's article shows how the former negativity within Homeric studies has recently given way to a more positive assessment since archaeology has tended to vindicate the customs and material culture, mentioned by the poet, as historically accurate, although the stories were written several hundred years after the events. By analogy, if accurate historical details could be kept alive in an oral tradition over many centuries in the Greek world, it is certainly possible that the biblical world could have done the same (cf. further treatment of this topic in Edwin Yamauchi, "Historic Homer," *BAR* 33/2 [2007]: 28-37, 76; and Hershel Shanks and Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier, "Greeks vs. Hittites: Why Troy is Troy and the Trojan War is Real," *Archaeology Odyssey* 5/4 [2002]: 24-35, 53). In the article "Amorites and Israelites," Millard uses the Amorites as an analogy to show that the Bible can stand on its own as a historical source—even without archaeological support—a position advanced further by Bill Arnold ("Nebuchadnezzar and Solomon," *BAR* 33/1 [2007]: 48-54, 76), who focuses on Neo-Babylonian connections.

Under the section on using texts in biblical archaeology, Hallo replies to those who are critical of the title of his new coedited three-volume series of extrabiblical literary material (and K. Lawson Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture* [Brill: 2003]) by noting that the five linguistic cultures included in the series were linked inextricably both with each other and with biblical culture; and that since the ancient Near East was a geographical unity, developments in one area spread rapidly to the others (173); thus the wide interdisciplinary focus of biblical archaeology, which covers the temporal and geographical limits of the ancient cultures in this part of the world. Younger's essay traces Assyrian deportees into Samaria from the places identified in 2 Kgs 17 and cuneiform texts (on this topic see also Nadav Na'aman and Ran Zadok, "Assyrian Deportations to the Province of Samaria in Light of Two Cuneiform Tablets from Tel Hadid," *TA* 27 [2000]: 159-88).

In the section on hermeneutics and theology, Monson tackles the issue of the role of archaeology in biblical interpretation and whether it should influence exegesis. He shows how theologians have indeed used material culture to interpret the Bible during the last two millennia, even before the advent of the modern discipline of archaeology. Using the contextual approach, which also includes the geographical setting, he presents cogent examples of the proper use of archaeology in biblical interpretation. Vaughn's essay on the possibility of writing a history of Israel in modern times (another question asked frequently by Dever) is seemingly aimed at the postmodern world, where individuals in different social locations experience texts in different ways (385); hence his positive and negative history and the concept of historical imagination, via Brueggemann, may remain less persuasive for those who hold a more conservative view of history and Scripture.

Though multiauthored, *The Future of Biblical Archaeology* shows consistency in theme in that most of the authors present their views of what biblical archaeology means as well

as where they believe the discipline is heading. However, not all of the authors are so like-minded. Scolnic's essay on the identification of Migdol, for instance, though interesting and covering some of the same ground as Hoffmeier, follows a more traditional, text-based approach in its methodology and hence does not advance the discipline in any significant way. Ortiz also uses a traditional ceramic typological approach to take on the deconstructionist views of Israel Finkelstein, who, taking his cue from recent trends in biblical studies, uses archaeology by aggressively pushing a low Iron Age chronology to replace the united monarchy of the Bible with a small tribal chiefdom. By dealing with the ceramics from the relevant Iron Age sites, and consequently picking apart the basic tenets of this position, Ortiz demonstrates the viability of both the high chronology, as well as a tenth-century-B.C. united monarchy. Not to detract from the importance of the article, which forms a necessary reply to an attack upon one of the major beliefs of both the Bible and the discipline of biblical archaeology, it nevertheless seems to be somewhat out of place in a volume that focuses on new directions. In some ways Hoffner's essay is a bit of an enigma. Like others, in the section on using texts in biblical archaeology, it focuses on the literature of one culture (in this case Hittite) in comparison with that of the Bible. However, in contrast to the others it seems to take a more negative stance toward archaeology, as opposed to texts. It also seems to perpetuate to some degree the fallacy of negative proof, i.e., the attempt to sustain a factual proposition on the basis of nonevidence; in this case, since no Hittite texts have been found in Israel, Hittite influence on the Bible must have been mediated through Syria (192).

The book is well edited, with only a few mechanical errors. Since it is a collection of essays, graphics do not figure prominently. Nevertheless, there are four maps, five tables, four pottery plates with descriptions, and two figures distributed within three of its essays. An index would have made the volume more user friendly. This book is a must-read for those seeking to understand from where biblical archaeology has come, as well as where the discipline may be heading.

Andrews University

PAUL J. RAY, JR.

Horton, Michael S. *Covenant and Salvation: Union with Christ*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007. xi + 324 pp. Paper, \$34.95.

Michael S. Horton writes from a staunchly traditional Reformed theological position, drawing heavily on Calvin and to a lesser extent Luther. In this second of four volumes on covenant theology, Horton (*Lord and Servant: A Covenant Christology*; and *Covenant and Eschatology: The Divine Drama*) interacts with Catholic, Jewish, and other Reformed scholars intending to show systematically that his covenant motif establishes forensic justification alone as a means to salvation, and provides an ontology in which union with Christ is devoid of merit-based human participation in salvation. His covenantal theology forms a matrix from which forensic justification emerges and, consequently, makes union possible and inevitable. Forensic justification then is the only source of man's righteousness in an *ordo salutis*—order of salvation—based on Rom 8:30.

Horton's entire soteriology begins by distinguishing between two covenants in which God has related to mankind. The first is a "covenant of promise," known as a "royal grant" in ancient Near Eastern terms. What was determined from eternity, God unilaterally confirmed with Abraham and is the promise later fulfilled in Christ. Its unilaterality means it is unconditional because God not only promised Abraham, but swore by himself—by two immutable oaths (Heb 6) in which it is impossible for God to lie. This covenant is the only basis of man's attainment to righteousness. In contrast, the "covenant of law," known as a "suzerain-vassal" treaty, is conditional in nature, and