

pay tribute to pioneers like Thackeray and de Lagarde, but a clear delineation of what has stood the test of time needs to be made available. For example, does Thackeray's b section end in 2 Reigns 10, or at the end of chapter 9 as Shenkel proposed? While it is a small point in itself, when gathered with all such similar research it can help to establish the field on a firm footing. If discussion and debate are needed, let them take place. When we venerate the pioneers, we too easily fail to appreciate current research. LXX studies have an incredible group of well-trained young scholars who need to know that what they do matters.

In conclusion, I wholeheartedly endorse the book. It is an invitation to a difficult field in which so much is necessarily technical. I found myself making footnote references for further reading all the way through and noting details here and there. The volume is well written and well edited. My critical reading of the Greek and Hebrew found very few glitches, which are of a minor nature. This text is an excellent graduate-level text, especially when used alongside such works as Tov's *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Simor, 1997, 2d ed.), the portions relevant to the LXX in Tov's *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Fortress, 2001, 2d ed.), and Natalio Fernández Marcos's *The Septuagint in Context* (Brill, 2001).

Loma Linda University  
Loma Linda, California

BERNARD TAYLOR

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible, vol. 35A. New York: Doubleday, 2001. xiv + 494 pp. Paper, \$40.00.

For more than a decade there has been a conspicuous absence of critical commentaries in English dealing with the Pastoral Epistles. However, with the publication of four such works by such notable authors as I. Howard Marshall, Jerome D. Quinn, William D. Mounce, and Luke Timothy Johnson within the last three years, that is no longer the case. While each of these commentaries reflects the diversity of opinion among scholars about the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles (for my review of Quinn, see *AUSS* 39 (2001): 149-151), the perspective taken by Johnson makes his commentary the most distinctive, if not unique. Building on his previous work in the Pastorals, Johnson, who is New Testament Professor at the Chandler School of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, challenges the scholarly consensus that the Pastoral Epistles are pseudepigraphical and interprets 1 and 2 Timothy as authentic letters "written by Paul to his delegate Timothy" (98).

While advocating the minority position, Johnson does not attempt to avoid the multiple problems raised by the Pastoral Epistles; rather, he acknowledges that "virtually everything about these compositions is a matter of dispute" (14). To provide readers with a context in which they can base their own judgments, the introduction begins with an extensive account of the history of interpretation of 1 and 2 Timothy. In twenty-three pages of noteworthy insights, Johnson chronicles the use of these epistles in the Apostolic Fathers, Patristic and Medieval commentaries, as well as in commentaries from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. The final section then concisely traces the decisive turn in the history of interpretation that occurred during

the nineteenth century. This section is one of the primary strengths of the commentary and is worthy of consideration regardless of one's position on the authorship of the Pastorals.

The General Introduction is divided into three sections. In the first section, "Assessing the Authorship of the Pastoral Letters," Johnson begins with an examination of what he considers to be tendencies in the current debate. He argues that the present consensus reflects uncritical acceptance of the position of inauthenticity as a settled "fact." He believes that the social fact of this consensus has become more relevant than the "textual evidence itself" (56). The commentary then examines the problematic textual evidence associated with the Pastorals—their historical setting, style, opponents, and ecclesiastical organization. After describing the conventional solution, Johnson outlines what he believes are five basic difficulties with the conventional hypothesis: selective use of evidence, comparison between composite constructs, faulty assumptions about pseudonymity, unconvincing circumstances of composition, and the failure to account for the "irreducible differences between the Pastoral Letters" (89).

While Johnson notes the "impossibility of *demonstrating* the authenticity of the Pastoral Letters," in the second and third sections of the General Introduction he proposes a way of reading each of the letters as independent literary entities "that is compatible with placement within Paul's ministry and with Pauline 'authorship'" (91). He contends that 1 Timothy (and Titus) are best understood when classified as part of the literary genre that has been termed broadly "royal correspondence" (*mandata principis*, commandments of a ruler). This genre, which includes quasi-public letters for newly appointed delegates, containing personal and communal instructions and sometimes even focusing on the character of a delegate, provides a striking analogy to the social situation envisioned in 1 Timothy. While he acknowledges that there are difficulties with locating the *mise-en-scène* of 1 Timothy in Acts, Johnson suggests that it is possible to place it during the three-month period after the uproar in Ephesus when Timothy's presence is unreported during Paul's activities in Macedonia (Acts 20:1-2).

Due to a combination of personal exhortation and polemic against false teachers, Johnson suggests that the literary genre of 2 Timothy is best understood as a combination of personal, paraenetic letter and Hellenistic protreptic discourse. Though this classification is plausible, I did not find it nearly as intriguing or convincing as his classification of the genre of 1 Timothy. Johnson contends that the setting of 2 Timothy is congruous with the description of Paul's Roman imprisonment described in Acts.

The present work contains the author's own translation of 1 and 2 Timothy, a separate introduction and commentary for each letter, concluding indices to Scripture references, ancient sources and authors, and a full and up-to-date bibliography. A particularly helpful feature of the bibliography is the chronological division of citations into Patristic, Medieval, sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, and nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Will Johnson's work stimulate a reevaluation of the academic consensus against Pauline authorship of the Pastorals? Only time will tell. Whether it ultimately does or does not, his examination of the history of interpretation,

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, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999. xxii + 1040 pp. Hardcover, \$60.00.

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