REVIEW OF BOOKS

Books and articles sent to the secretary of this Journal will be reviewed as soon as possible.


Besides an introduction and the usual indexes, this book collects the papers read at the 49th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies in May 1981. All of them are devoted to the book of Job. R. J. Williams treats the current trends in the study of the biblical writing by drawing attention to publications from the last thirty years. P. C. Craigie discusses the impact of Ugaritic studies on Joban research. Claude E. Cox is concerned with Elihu's second speech according to LXX and holds that its shorter text is to be attributed to abbreviation by the translator. Our readers will take a special interest in the editor's essay on 'Aramaic Studies and the Book of Job' in which he mainly concentrates on 11QtgJob. In the field of text criticism he suggests that the original text of Job 21:22 had *dnym* instead of *rmym*. The LXX writer mistranslated by "murderers", but the author of 11QtgJob chose to translate the Hebrew by the Aramaic word *rmy*’, "deceivers". Another area to which the Aramaic Job makes a contribution is the history of ideas, as can be seen from 11QtgJob 33:8 (MT 39:27), were *m'mr*’ occurs as a translation of Hebrew *pê*. The Pentateuchal targums, however, never use *mymr*’ alone for the human voice, but show a tendency to use it to translate only the divine *pê* in order to distinguish the voice of God and the voice of men.

The small volume is a helpful introduction to current debate on the canonical book of Job and related literature.

A. S. van der Woude


The purpose of this book is "to study the usage of Daniel in early Jewish and Christian apocalyptic in order to obtain a better interpretative understanding of these writings and to observe any possible relationship..."
which might exist among them. Furthermore, the study should provide more data with which to make comparisons with the employment of the O.T. in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, especially as this pertains to method” (p. 2). After an Introduction (Ch. 1), the author deals with his subject in three main parts: The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic (Qumran, I Enoch, IV Ezra, II Baruch); The Use of Daniel in the Book of Revelation; and Conclusion (which contains a comparative analysis of the texts studied, and implications of the analysis).

In Ch. II on the use of Daniel in Jewish apocalyptic the author examines first of all the use of răz and țeșer in Qumran. As far as răz is concerned, his conclusions seem to be somewhat ambiguous. On the one hand he stresses that the Qumran use of the term points to a Danielic background (“primarily because of its emphasized eschatological nuance”), on the other hand he admits that since no formal allusions or citations occur the links between Daniel and Qumran seem to be indirect. The author’s suggestion that răz has an eschatological nuance in Daniel and Qumran cannot be substantiated in all cases. Daniel 4 which uses the term in connection with Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in my opinion should not be seen as an initial stage of fulfillment of the eschatological prophecies of chapters 2 and 7, and in 1QS XI, 3-4 we encounter a non-eschatological use of răz. According to BEALE, the țeșer exegetical method of Qumran has the book of Daniel as its primary model and influence. I doubt that there exists a direct literary dependence. It seems more likely that Daniel and Qumran share a common heritage in this respect, cf. Genesis 40-41 and Eccles. 8:1. This does not mean that Qumran writings in some cases cannot be dependent on Daniel. I agree with BEALE that 1QM 1 alludes to Daniel 11-12. His observation that Daniel 11 is conceptually subsumed within the interpretative model of Daniel 12:1-3 in 1QM 1 is certainly worth considering.

The author may also be right in contending that I Enoch 90:9-27 shows a structural and allusive dependence on Daniel. B. bases his view predominantly on a comparison of I Enoch 90:20-27 with Daniel 7:9-13. The identical structure of the two passages is indeed striking. But did the author of the Dream Visions have access to Daniel 7 in its present form a few years only after its composition? (The book of Daniel in its final form is dated to 165, the Dream Visions to 164-161 B.C.).

According to BEALE Test. Joseph 19:6-12 may be dependent on Daniel. The Similitudes of I Enoch unmistakably show allusions to Daniel or Danielic dominance. The assertion that IV Ezra 11-12 is modelled on Daniel 7 fully agrees with the conclusion reached by other scholars. Ezra 13:1-39 seems to be a midrash on Daniel 2 and 7, whereas II Baruch 36-42 shows Danielic influence as well, at least in chapters 38 and 39.

Ch. III of BEALE’s book contains a comprehensive treatment of the use of Daniel in the Book of Revelation chapters 1, 4-5, 13 and 17. We cannot