

once mentions that Onyame, the supreme being of the Akan, is also known as Onyame Kwame—the Saturday god. He says that there are no “shrines to Nyame” (49), but do shrines have to be physical? Can they be temporal? Hopefully a second edition will fill these significant lacunae.

Oakwood College
Huntsville, Alabama

KEITH A. BURTON

Grenz, Stanley J., David Guretzki, and Cherith Fee Nordling. *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms*. 128 pp. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999. Paperback, \$6.99.

The *Pocket Dictionary* was written by Stanley J. Grenz, professor of theology and ethics at Carey Hall/Regent College, Vancouver, British Columbia; David Guretzki, professor of theology and dean at Briarcrest Bible College, Caronport, Saskatchewan; and Cherith Fee Nordling, a doctoral student in theology, King’s College, University of London. Grenz, a well-known author, has written on a wide range of topics, including the course of evangelical theology in the twenty-first century (*Revisioning Evangelical Theology: A Fresh Agenda for the 21st Century* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993]); postmodernism (*A Primer on Postmodernism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996]); the basics of ethics (*The Moral Quest: Foundations of Christian Ethics* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997]); and the central tenets of Christian faith (*What Christians Really Believe and Why* [Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998]).

The *Pocket Dictionary* is arranged in alphabetical order. The authors write from a “broadly evangelical, Protestant perspective” (5) and have focused on “basic, generally held definitions” (5). The authors’ goal is to provide a “basic understanding of the three hundred or so significant words and concepts you are most likely to encounter in the theological books and articles you are reading” (5). The entries are primarily English terms; however, key phrases in other languages are also included—“especially Latin and German.” For example, the *Pocket Dictionary* defines *Heilsgechichte* as follows:

A German term meaning “history of salvation.” Originally coined by Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687-1752), the term was used to describe the nature of the Bible as an account of God’s working out divine *salvation in human history. Proponents of this approach rejected the idea that the Bible is a collection of divine “proof texts” for constructing doctrine in favor of seeing it as the history of God’s redemptive plan. In the middle of the twentieth century many theologians adopted elements of the *Heilsgechichte* approach to biblical interpretation (e.g., Oscar Cullmann, Gerhard von Rad), although there were some notable exceptions (e.g., Rudolf *Bultmann). (58)

The book is cross-referenced with an asterisk before a term or phrase indicating that it appears elsewhere in the book as a separate entry. Therefore, the definition of *Heilsgechichte* provides cross-referencing for “salvation” (105) and “Rudolf Bultmann” (22). Additional references point to entries that might provide further information. As demonstrated in the definition of *Heilsgechichte*, a select

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

Hasel, Michael G. *Domination and Resistance: Egyptian Military Activity in the Southern Levant, ca. 1300-1185 B.C.* Boston: Brill Academic, 1998. 372 pp. Hardcover, \$117.75.

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