

Furnish has added an appendix treating the various words for love in the NT. Besides the expected thing, he points out that *agapan* is not always used in the distinctively NT way and, on the other hand, *philein* is used more often with the meaning associated with *agapan*. Indices of passages and authors are included. It would have been very helpful if the author had included a bibliography.

This is a careful and skillfully written work. The author is very judicious with the evidence and fair to opposing views, but nevertheless forthright in presenting his own positions. It will remain the standard work on this topic for a long time to come.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Gilkey, Langdon B. *Religion and the Scientific Future*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970. x + 193 pp. \$5.95.

The purpose of the book, which represents a series of lectures given at various places, is to seek for a whiff of the transcendent from within the *activity* of the scientist. With the dominating influence of science in Western culture there has come a progressive retreat from reference to the transcendent in our thinking. The advance of science has involved the debunking of the myths about the gods, and the development of historical science has resulted in the dehistoricization of what in the myths, couched as they often are in the language of history, time and space, appeared to former ages as historical.

Does this mean that the symbolic language of religion, which forms the basis of the theologian's discourse, represents something that has now faded from the cultural grasp of modern man? Does man's "coming of age" mean not only that he no longer creates myths and symbols but that he cannot understand the process at all, since there is no common ground in his experience with the myth-maker of the past? Are there no longer any spots in his total experience where the talk of ultimate reality or values is relevant?

Gilkey's point is that such language is indispensable if we are to do proper justice to the concerns of the scientist. Such theological elements are to be looked for, not in the conclusions of science (where the liberals found them) but in the *activity* of scientific inquiry. Specifically the scientist is concerned for truth, objectivity and rationality. Such concern is of the nature of a commitment, an "unconditioned affirmation" that truth is to be found and that truth is of essential importance. Science is not the impersonal activity of an uncommitted intellect. The scientist has a passion to know, and the obligation to make judgments according to adequate criteria.

Once the scientist is distinguished as inquirer after truth, and as engaged in the process of considering the application of the knowledge he has, we are in two quite different spheres. To raise the question of the use of the knowledge at the scientist's command is to enter the realm of moral discussion. Here traditional discussions become relevant, for example the discussion concerning man's freedom. So the way is open for theological discourse. As man involved in the application of knowledge to human problems, the scientist can become the subject of a discussion about man.

What about the future? The irony of the situation of modern man is that

he cannot master the use to which his technological knowledge will be put. So when he thinks of the future he necessarily thinks in mythical terms. He must consider man's corruption and his irrationality. These themes are the concerns of the theologian, whose symbols may now take on a new meaning. When so much of the fashion is to dub modern man as "secular" "come of age" (meaning man's imperviousness to the transcendent in any shape or form and so the irrelevance of any theological talk to him), it is salutary to be reminded that such expressions are only clichés. If they give the impression of man's mastery of his fate they are grossly misleading. It is a false step to move from mastery of nature to mastery of the future.

Gilkey has found the transcendent in the very heart of modern man's central activity of knowing. If this fort can be taken, others can also. Gilkey holds that because it is science which has produced the 20th-century culture in which we all share, this is the decisive fort. The assumption behind the lectures is that if one can get at modern man at the point where he appears most secular, and show that at this point, within this activity, transcendent categories are meaningful, one has, so to speak, broken the back of the claim to total secularization.

The book is a most welcome example of apologetic theology. The method is not new, but the book has a freshness derived from the crispness of the style.

Of the 180 pages of text, 48, finely printed ones, comprise footnotes. These set the questions considered within the context of contemporary theological discussion, and also provide in adequate length, treatment of those philosophers of science upon whom Gilkey has drawn. But, why must publishers put such notes at the end of the book? One wonders why publishers are not required to distinguish between "footnotes" and "endnotes" and make some sort of compensation for the inconvenience caused by the latter.

Nottingham, England

EDWARD W. H. VICK

Goedicke, Hans, ed. *Near Eastern Studies: In Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1971. xxvi + 474 pp. \$15.00.

On September 19, 1971, William Foxwell Albright, the world's leading scholar in ancient Near Eastern studies, died. The book under review is a *Festschrift* consisting of 35 papers written by leading scholars of Biblica and Near Eastern studies offered as a tribute to Albright on his 80th birthday. It now stands as a monument to the brilliant mind, industry, competency, achievement, vision and devotion of one who succeeded in many areas in which others have failed. After an opening personal appreciation by W. Phillips, the articles, in English, German, and French, deal with the wide range of Albright's lifelong scholarly interests in biblical history, religion, linguistics, philosophy, archaeology, text criticism, Semitics, and so on.

Several essays are devoted to Hebrew grammar and syntax. F. I. Andersen (Berkeley) presents a description of the Hebrew passive and ergative in light of transformational grammar and comparative linguistics. M. Dahood (Rome)