

involves some begging of the question and not a little reasoning in circles. The author's brilliance and originality are evident; but the problem needs to be attacked by more objective method.

The Wellhausen hypothesis does indeed need to be re-examined, and the world of scholarship is currently busy doing so. The present work is a novel, if not too convincing contribution to that effort. It suffers further from the fact that where reference is made to the works of others (not as often as could be wished) almost never is exact documentation given, a thing that the careful student demands.

JOHN BRIGHT

---

*The Book of Daniel*, by JULIUS A. BEWER. (Harper's Annotated Bible Series, No. 12.) Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955. 37 pp. 75 cents.

THESE notes on the Book of Daniel constitute the last published work of the late Professor Bewer (seen through the press by Dr. Emil Kracling). As is characteristic of the series, the bulk of the booklet is devoted to reprinting the King James Version, along with the author's introduction and critical notes to the text. In this case, the introduction is all too brief, and the notes are compressed beyond the point of clarity and effectiveness.

Despite the current vigorous debate over the date and unity of Daniel, Bewer holds firmly to the older (and

still dominant) scholarly view that the book as a whole was composed in the early years of the Jewish struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes (ca. 165 B.C.), though the author may have used older sources in compiling the stories of Daniel and his friends (Chaps. 1-6). The notes provide explanations for numerous textual difficulties, and historical data to elucidate the many cryptic references to persons and events in the Book of Daniel. For the average reader, however, a good deal more information about the Greek era in the ancient Near East would be desirable, along with chronological tables and a historical outline.

Unfortunately no mention is made of the Dead Sea sect and its scrolls, though they have an important relationship to Daniel which requires investigation. We know, for example, that the sect used the Book of Daniel; fragments of several MSS have been found, dating from within 100-200 years of the original composition (and already exhibiting the same peculiar shift from Hebrew, 1-2:4, to Aramaic, 2:4-7, and back to Hebrew, 8-12). In addition, the theological vocabulary and apocalyptic imagery of Daniel lie in the immediate background of the sect, and are echoed constantly in its literature.

Helpful as Bewer's notes are, they require considerable supplementation in the light of recent discussion and discovery. It is regrettable that the final work of this eminent scholar should be so little satisfying.

DAVID N. FREEDMAN