coupled with his scholarly critique of the majority position and arguments for Pauline authorship make his work a necessary consideration for anyone interested in a study of the Pastorals.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

CARL P. COSAERT


Keener begins by outlining the focus of his commentary. He is aware of the insights provided by source criticism (he adopts the two-source hypothesis), form, redaction and literary criticism, and sociological interpretation, and at times draws on these disciplines. In general, though, he remains true to his declared methodology: “This commentary focuses especially on two aspects of interpretation: analysis of the social-historical contexts of Matthew and his traditions on the one hand, and pericope-by-pericope suggestions concerning the nature of Matthew’s exhortations to his Christian audience on the other” (1). Thus, the commentary deals primarily with the meaning of the various passages, generally considered from the perspective of the whole pericope under discussion. These comments are often supplemented by excursuses dealing with particular points of interest. The excursuses range over a variety of topics—debates about the virgin birth (83-86); some contemporary views on wealth (229-230); demons and exorcism (283-286); the development of antichrist tradition (573-575); mysteries, resurrection, and salvation (705-708); and Jewish resurrection theology (710-711)—all of which add interest and value to the work.

Keener has provided a commentary that will be useful to a number of different groups. Its strong academic base and extensive references to both ancient sources and modern secondary literature will help to facilitate further research into particular points. Further, by concentrating on the meaning that the text has for the community in which it was originally used, Keener has produced a work that will also be of interest to those outside of the academic community. It has much material, for example, on which sermons could be based, which does not distract from the serious nature of the commentary. The work is based on the Greek text of Matthew, but the few Greek words cited are transliterated, making the commentary accessible to a wider reading audience.

Keener evaluates the reliability of Jesus’ teachings in Matthew and concludes that they have a strong claim to reliability. Indeed, “in any given instance the burden of proof weighs on those who deny, rather than on those who affirm, historical authenticity” (24). The narrative sections of the Gospel also contain reliable information (32-36). In an earlier commentary on the Gospel, Keener declared himself uncomfortable with the usual identification of the evangelist as the disciple Matthew, but further thought has now led him to the opinion that indeed Matthew is the most likely author. He locates the Matthean community in an urban center in Syro-Palestine and dates it in the mid-70s.

In a work of this size, it is unlikely that a reader will agree with everything stated in the text. Even the lower estimate of 500 inhabitants given as the population of first-century Nazareth seems rather high (113) and, likewise, his
estimates of the yield of seed planted in Palestine are high. Four to five times what is sown is more likely than the seven-and-a-half to ten times that is suggested by Keener (377). Furthermore, his supposition that “even a hundredfold harvest is not ‘miraculous’ for some parts of Palestine” (377-78) is highly unlikely to be true. These points, of course, do not lie at the center of Keener’s concerns in the commentary, and he is not alone in his positions. So they do not distract from the generally sound and helpful comments that he makes about the Gospel. This commentary is a welcome addition to the literature on Matthew.

Avondale College
Cooranbong, New South Wales, Australia

Rob McIver


With the Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel, Klaus Koch (one of the foremost Danielic scholars) and Martin Rösel (a text critic and LXX expert) have prepared a valuable reference tool for study of the book of Daniel. Originally a project carried out from 1975 to 1988 at the University of Hamburg under Koch, the polyglot was taken up in 1997 by Koch and Rösel, who recorded the text-critical apparatus anew. The final product’s content is straightforward: After a short introduction comes the heart of the volume—almost 150 double pages of synopsis with apparatus—concluded by an appendix and a list of abbreviations.

The raison d’être for such a polyglot edition of Daniel goes without saying. The textual variety of Daniel is a challenge to anyone studying the text and composition of this apocalyptic book. For textual criticism of Daniel, one must usually wade through the text-critical editions of the different versions, the more recent publications of the Qumran manuscripts, and the Chester Beatty Papyrus 967. With the Polyglottensynopse, it is now possible for the first time to have a quick overview of the different versions and their variants, including the recently published Qumran material and Papyrus 967. For this reason, the volume greatly facilitates the initial steps of text-critical study and thus should be heartily welcomed.

In the Introduction, the editors describe the problem of textual variety of the book of Daniel, briefly discuss which text editions of the various versions they used for the Polyglottensynopse, and explain how the apparatus was brought up-to-date. The features of the polyglot itself are explained and several lists and tables supply information on the versions’ different witnesses to Daniel. Here, the preserved lengths of some of the extant fragments from Qumran need to be corrected: 4Q4 4:12-16 and 7:15-23 (instead of 4:12-14; 7:15-19; 7:21-23?) and 4Q5 5:10-12 (instead of 5:10-11).

In the synopsis proper, five text columns are arranged in parallel lines on each double page. From left to right these texts are the MT, Peshitta, Theodotion, Old Greek, and Vulgate. The specific arrangement is explained in the introduction in terms of text affinity: MT functions as the text basis, Peshitta generally shows identical lexemes to the Aramaic parts of the MT, Theodotion is close to the Peshitta as well as closer to the MT than the Old Greek, Old Greek and Vulgate then follow. In each column, each clause is placed on a separate line and numbered.