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

Koch, Klaus, and Martin Rösel. *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2000. 322 pp. Hardcover, € 99.00.

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: $4Q^d$ 4:12-16 and 7:15-23 (instead of 4:12-14; 7:15-19; 7:21-23?) and $4Q^b$ 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

consecutively for easy reference. The Hebrew (MT) column is the text of *BHS*. The Syriac column is the Leiden *Vetus Testamentum Syriace* (supplied with historical rubrics according to Walton's polyglot), presented here in square script with vocalization for the purpose of comparison with the MT and to enhance its accessability. The text columns of Theodotion and Old Greek are according to A. Rahlfs's *Septuaginta*, rather than the first Daniel edition of the Göttingen Septuagint series (1954) in which J. Ziegler tends to correct the text toward the MT, particularly in Dan 7:13, where the Old Greek closely identifies the "Son of Man" figure with the "Ancient of Days." The *Polyglottensynopse* notes differences between Rahlfs and Ziegler in the apparatus. The Vulgate text is from R. Weber's *Biblia Sacra*.

The text-critical apparatus printed below the five columns lists the individual textual variants, but not the orthographic differences or conjectures. Here the line numbers of the parallel columns function as a reference system for the comments in the text-critical apparatus. For this apparatus, the text-critical notes of the *BHK*, *BHS*, the Leiden Peshitta, and the Göttingen *Septuaginta* (1954 edition) have been collated. It is commendable that Koch and Rösel have attempted to bring the apparatus up-to-date. In addition to the above sources, the apparatus includes the variants in the eight Daniel scrolls from Qumran and in a Yemenite Daniel manuscript (Y) that probably dates from the fourteenth century (Shelomo Morag, *The Book of Daniel: A Babylonian-Yemenite Manuscript* [Jerusaelm: Kiryat-Sepher, 1973]). The inclusion of the latter is unusual. Koch and Rösel justify it by pointing to textual variants of Y that supposedly reflect a textual tradition different from the Tiberian, but it is clear that the Tiberian tradition of biblical Aramaic has to be regarded as older than the Babylonian tradition of biblical Aramaic (so Morag, xv). For the Old Greek, the whole of Papyrus 967 is referenced in the apparatus, whereas Ziegler (1954) had access only to chapters 3 to 8. It is regrettable that Koch and Rösel could not use the second edition of *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* in the Göttingen Septuagint series (1999), which presents an extensive revision of the Old Greek text, along with a new text-critical apparatus by O. Munnich and an addendum by D. Fraenkel on the new fragmentary textual witnesses to Theodotion.

The value and usefulness of a text-critical apparatus is determined by its level of accuracy. Absolute preciseness should be expected. At times, however, the apparatus in the *Polyglottensynopse* lacks such a high standard. After checking the text-critical notes that refer to the Qumran manuscripts, I have found several corrections and additions that should be made. Of course, regarding the Daniel manuscripts from 4Q, Koch and Rösel could only use the preliminary editions, since the *editio princeps* published in DJD 16 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000) were not available to them. However, the differences between these editions are minimal and would have almost no effect on the text-critical notes.

The following corrections are needed in the apparatus of the *Polyglottensynopse*:

on 1:13	p. 21/41:3	read "1Qª פח בנ״" instead of "4Qª פח בנ"
on 1:16	p. 22/50:3	read "1Qª זרעים" instead of "1Qª דרעים"
on 6:11	p. 170/078:7	read "4Qᵇ [קור]ם" instead of "4Qᵇ [קר]ם" (cf. 6:14 where 4Qᵇ reads קודם instead of MT קרם)
on 7:28	p. 213/153:2	read "4Qª יהשנון" instead of "4Qª יהשנין"
on 8:1	p. 214/002a	the note "4Qª דבר נגלה" creates the impression that 4Qª inserts these words before חזון נראה as a variant to MT. However, the scribe of 4Qª first wrote דבר נגלה (apparently using the formula in Dan 10:1) and then, after realizing his error, crossed out the two words with a double horizontal stroke.
on 10:8	p. 262/034:4	read "4Qᶜ הגדול הזה" instead of "4Qᶜ הגדול"
on 11:15	p. 286/089:1	read "4Qᵃᶜ ושפך" instead of "4Qª ושפך"

The following textual variants should be added to the apparatus of the *Polyglottensynopse* (the MT reading is provided in brackets for the sake of convenience):

on 2:27	p. 40/131:4	4Qª חרטמים	(MT חרטמין)
on 3:25	p. 76/287p	4Qᵈ נבכד נצ]ר	(plus of 4Qᵈ)
on 4:15	p. 100/106:1-2	4Qᵈ כלקבל	(כל־קבל MT)
on 6:10	p. 170/068:1-2	4Qᵇ כלקבל	(כל־קבל MT)
on 7:6	p. 194/033:7	4Qª נביהא	(נביה MT)
on 10:13	p. 266/059:1	4Qᶜ [ו]שׂרי	(ושׂר MT)
on 11:15	p. 286/089:2	4Qᶜ סולל	(סוללה MT)
on 11:16	p. 286/097:2	4Qᶜ המא	(הבא MT)
on 11:16	p. 286/100:2	4Qᶜ בעזו	(בידו MT)
on 11:17	p. 288/101:2	4Qᶜ בינו	(פניו :MT)
on 11:17	p. 288/102:3	4Qᶜ כע	(obviously an error of the correct MT כל)

There is one problematic case that should receive a further note: On Dan 10:15 (268, line 068:2) the apparatus of the polyglot notes "pap6Q אֵיר" according to DJD 3:115. However, E. Ulrich now argues that the ink traces favor, and the spacing demands, the longer reading [ך]פ ת[א] (E. Ulrich, "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Book of Daniel*, vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint [Leiden: Brill, 2001], 579).

Since a synopsis of the additions (Dan 3:24-90 and 14:1-42) has been published earlier (Klaus Koch, *Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch*, AOAT 38/1-2 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1987]), they are not repeated in the present volume. However, in an appendix, the Aramaic text of the additions Dan 3:24-90 and 14:23-42 from the *Chronicle of Jerahmeel* is presented according to the edition by M. Gaster and supplied with text-critical notes. The *Polyglottensynopse* concludes with a list of abbreviations employed in its text-critical apparatus.

The *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel* is a quick reference for comparing the different versions and will be an invaluable tool for those who investigate the textual variety and text-critical issues of the book of Daniel. Although it could have profited from later publications (e.g. DJD 16 and the second edition of the Göttingen Septuagint of Daniel), the *Polyglottensynopse* will surely find its place next to the critical editions of the various versions. However, these editions remain irreplaceable for one who wants to delve deeper into the text-critical study of specific passages and the complex history of the text of Daniel.

Berrien Springs, Michigan   MARTIN PRÖBSTLE

Krahmalkov, Charles R. *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 90. Studia Phoenicia, 15. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2000. 499 pp. Hardcover, $70.00.

Charles Krahmalkov's contributions to Northwest Semitic studies, including Phoenician and Punic, span a period of over three decades. Thus, the dictionary under review and a companion volume, *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), represent the product of many years of fruitful research.

The dictionary contains the entire lexicon of Phoenician and Punic occurring in extant continuous texts, including personal names. For the sake of consistency, entries are given in Standard Phoenician spelling in the order of the West Semitic alphabet. Phoenician words are rendered in italicized transliteration. Verbs are listed with hyphens between root letters. Hollow verbs are treated as biradical. The author also includes phrases such as *lpn z* ("earlier, in the past"), and gives special attention to items that shed light on culture and religion. Each entry begins with a line having a list of selected cognates in brackets, followed by another indented line with the part of speech and a simple gloss of a word or two or a phrase. Glosses with different semantic meanings are given in separate lines, such as for verbs occurring in different stems, or nouns with more than one meaning. Each gloss is followed by a paragraph of examples, translations, and source references. Proper names are not always glossed or translated. Sometimes there are special comments, cross-references to other entries, or references to the secondary literature. Due to the small size of the corpus of Phoenician and Punic texts, the