

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)

assumes that the author of Is 52:13 to 53:12 was a diaspora Jew living in Phoenicia since a preponderance of Phoenician elements including *scriptio defectiva*, third person singular suffix -y, morphology, and collocation exist in The Fourth Servant Song. A. Van Selms (Pretoria), reflecting on the formation of the feminine in Semitic languages, observes that the classification of substantives and verbs into gender came about after man solved the basic problem of survival: after he had learned to raise cattle, to plant, to sow, to harvest, to protect himself and his crops, and to build fortified places of dwelling. T. O. Lambdin (Cambridge, Mass.) argues in favor of a single origin for the definite article in Northwest Semitic and points out the restrictions in developing such an hypothesis.

The articles by H. Bardtke (Leipzig), G. Fohrer (Erlangen), E. Hammer-shaimb (Aarhus), and H. Ringgren (Uppsala) attempt to elucidate the problems of cult, myth, legend, theology, and history associated with the religion of ancient Israel.

H. B. Huffmon (Madison, N.J.) revives the famous theory of F. Delitzsch that the name of Yahweh is found among Amorite personal names. A. S. Kapelrud (Oslo), after discussing different schools of thought about the identity of the Suffering Servant, concludes that the message of the Servant Songs of salvation, deliverance, and comfort to a doomed people is characteristic of the Second Isaiah. New insights regarding textual criticism of Is are provided by K. Elliger (Tübingen), who centers on Second Isaiah, and G. R. Driver (Oxford), who provides a learned lexical note on Is 6:1.

The animosities between Israel-Judah and two perennial hostile allies, Damascus and Edom, are discussed by J. M. Myers (Gettysburg, Pa.) and J. A. Soggin (Rome). The former analyzes Edom and Judah against the background of the 6th-5th centuries, and the latter traces the problem between Syria and Israel in the Hebrew thought of the 9th-8th centuries.

O. Eissfeldt (Halle) comments on the Psalter as a source of history, and D. N. Freedman (Ann Arbor, Mich.) provides a structural analysis of Psalm 137. The etymological investigation of the king names Rehoboam and Jeroboam by J. J. Stamm (Bern) can be read with further profit against his previous essays on the subject. M. Greenberg (Jerusalem) continues his researches into Exodus by commenting on the redaction of the Plague narrative.

A. Jepsen (Greifswald) writes on Elijah as a prophet of Yahweh. M. A. Beek (Amsterdam) presents a discussion of Joshua as a messiah figure. W. Zimmerli (Göttingen) surveys the problems connected with the institution of the first-born and Levitism in the exilic and post-exilic biblical literature. Prophecies of the messianic king and Israel's role among the nations discussed by J. Coppens (Louvain) in his *Le messianisme royal* (1969) are further enhanced by his discussion of the remarks about the messianic king recorded in Mic 4:14 and 5:1-5.

The honoree's interest in Assyriology and in things Aramaic has been acknowledged by a number of articles. J. A. Fitzmyer (Bronx, N.Y.) reopens a discussion of an Aramaic marriage contract from Elephantine (AP 15) first published in 1906 by A. H. Sayce and A. E. Cowley as *Aramaic Papyri Discovered at Assuan*. H. Donner (Tübingen) comments on several Aramaic letters from Hermopolis. W. G. Lambert (Birmingham) interprets the text of

the Converse Tablet (named after a Colonel Converse of the U.S. Army, possessor of the tablet before it passed into Albright's hands), a hitherto unknown Sumerian liturgical text with an Akkadian translation for the cult of Nabu. R. J. Tournay (Jerusalem) restudies the eight-line inscription of Anam, King of Uruk and successor of Gilgamesh, first acknowledged in 1893. J. C. Greenfield (Jerusalem) accumulates parallels in ideas, idioms, phrases, and syntax from Phoenician inscriptions and the Hebrew Bible to strengthen an accepted belief of his that a common poetic and rhetorical tradition engulfed the ancient Northwest Semitic world.

The cursive Edomite, Phoenician, Aramaic, and Minaean Tell el-Kheleifeh inscriptions from the 7th to the 4th centuries are the subject of a study by the late N. Glueck (Cincinnati). S. Moscati (Rome) evaluates recent discoveries in Punic art found in Italy, and S. Segert (Los Angeles) suggests alterations and innovations of Hebrew Bible textual criticism in the light of Qumran. M. Pope (New Haven, Conn.) questions the interpretation of C. F. A. Schaeffer and C. Virolleaud of a scene depicted on a drinking mug from Ugarit, and presents a strong case that it represents the Canaanite myth II AB.

K. Galling (Tübingen) addresses himself to the varied traditions connected with books and writing in ancient Near Eastern history and culture.

J. Bowman (Victoria) concludes that the unnamed festival of John 5:1 is Purim, based on a more precise understanding of the Samaritan liturgical year and traditions about the Samaritan minor feast of Zimmuth Pesah.

Finally, F. C. Fensham (Stellenbosch) offers notes relating to "father and lord" and "son and servant" as terminology in biblical *berith* forms and ancient Near Eastern treaties, adding to the conclusions of D. J. McCarthy, F. Vattioni, W. L. Moran, H. B. Huffmon, and others.

The volume does not contain an index to subjects nor references to scriptures and other ancient writings. Appended to each essay are generous footnotes. Plates or drawings accompany the articles by Galling, Glueck, Lambert, Moscati, Pope, and Tournay.

Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys, California

ZEV GARBER

Hammershaimb, Erling. *The Book of Amos*. Transl. by John Sturdy. New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1970. 148 pp. \$8.50.

Since World War II a considerable number of monographs, commentaries, and articles have been published about the prophet Amos in Hebrew, English, German and other European languages. These publications, written for the most part by competent biblical scholars, have exhausted almost every conceivable problem of Amos both in literary and in higher criticism. Among the Amos studies which stand out as a brilliant exposition, succinct and clearly expressed, continually emphasizing points which are neglected by others, is this little Danish commentary originally published in 1946 (1967³), and now updated, altered by the author, and translated into felicitous English by John Sturdy, Dean of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

Hammershaimb, professor at the University of Aarhus, Denmark, has