

Review, *The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon*. By Gary Alan Chamberlain. Pp. xlii + 256. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2011. ISBN: 978 1 56563 741 2. £29.99.

(The author apologises for the tardiness of this review).

This sturdily bound and well-priced volume advertises itself as ‘an essential addition to any Greek New Testament lexicon’. Certainly the book is a useful compendium of information. But the book’s overall usefulness is damaged by numerous problems of conception and consistency. It is certain that a great deal of labour has gone into the book, and it seems crass to pick at details. On the other hand, a dictionary is only as good as the entry you are consulting it for: details are important in such a work. This review will concentrate on some details, and will hope to draw some larger conclusions from them.

The book is not a complete lexicon of the Greek Old Testament, although further work to produce such a work is announced (x); rather it is a ‘Supplement’ to the Bauer-Danker NT lexicon. Unfortunately, the result is that a reader of the Septuagint (hereafter, LXX) needs both books; and, unless equipped with extraordinary powers of memory, will not know in which book a given word is to be found. This is a serious disadvantage. Given the selective approach taken, this reviewer misses more bibliographical information. Did Chamberlain consult any etymological works? Or scholarly works on the history of Greek? Some of his comments (e.g. on *παταχρός*<sup>1</sup>) seem to suggest so, but no details are given. Some forms are quoted that are diagnostic for the history of Greek (a common variation is that between nouns in *-ημα* with those in *-εμα*); but their distribution in the text is not indicated in the text of the lexicon (e.g. s.v. *ἀνάστημα, εὔρεμα, ἔψεμα*).

Knowledge of Hebrew is assumed, *contra* p. x, insofar as it is quoted in original script (exceptions at 135 s.v. *πίπτω*) and is not glossed. This is reasonable when the information would be helpful for Hebrew scholars; but where the point at issue is one relevant for Greek (e.g. when the word is interpreted as a loanword), a bit more help with the Hebrew would have been desirable (see s.v. *πιπι* for a model of this). The LXX, after all, is also used by those without Hebrew.

In addition, some more morphological comment might have been helpful, particularly where LSJ is silent; I missed Chamberlain’s views on the forms *φαγόμεθα, φάγεσθε* (Gen. 3:3) – it seems pragmatically odd to see them as futures (with LSJ); but if so, what are they? Listing select innovative forms (e.g. *λήμνομαι*, future of *λαμβάνω* ≠ Attic *λήνομαι*; *ἔβαλα* ≠ Attic *ἔβαλλον*), even supposing them to be continued in the NT, would have made the dictionary more helpful for students; but this supplement gives no help. It is puzzling, by contrast, that the perfectly Attic paradigm of *λανθάνω* is given in full. It is useful to read about the Attic forms that the LXX still preserves (e.g. s.v. *θαρρέω*); still more useful would have been a full collection somewhere: these forms are of great interest for historical linguists.

The book is marred by an unacceptable level of errors; what follows is not an exhaustive list. The indication of first attestation are highly unreliable: *ἄβροχία* is first attested in Menander of Ephesus (quoted by Josephus), not Menander of Athens; likewise *ἀδελφιδοῦς* is first attested in Alcman, not Herodotus; *ἄγνος* is first attested in the *HomHymnMerc.410*; *αἰγίδιον* first in Pherecrates, not on papyri or inscriptions; *αἰδήμων* in Xenophon, not Aristotle; *κυνικός* is indeed first reliably attested in Menander, but there means ‘Cynic (philosopher)’, not ‘dog-like’; *κωλέα* (in the earlier form *κωλή*) is

---

<sup>1</sup> *παταχρός* is not treated by M. Brust *Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen* (Innsbruck 2008).

first attested in Xenophanes (6<sup>th</sup> c. B.C.), not Aristophanes; ᾠ first in Aristophanes, not the LXX. The condescending attitude to LSJ (see ix) is hardly justified in light of such errors. I note *en passant* that giving ‘pap(yrus)’ (e.g. ἀθέτημα, ) and ‘ins(criptions)’ (e.g. ἀγορασμός, ) as parallels is unhelpful: extant papyri are unlikely to antedate the LXX; in any case, without some indication of date, the note is not helpful. Noting entries as spurious is not helpful without listing the true reading (as s.v. ἀγνιασμός). The entry on ἀνάστημα takes no notice of LSJ’s supplement for the gloss ‘garrison’ for 1Sam 10:5, nor is the rendering ‘structure’ very plausible for Gen. 7:23 (see however LSJ’s citation of D.S. 5.17 for this word used of animals); false accent on οὐ in the entry on ἀντί, which should not read that ἀντί displays ‘attraction to the relative’ – this is not a case of attraction but of ἀντί governing a case like any other preposition; it is not clear to me how 4Macc. 10:5 is to be interpreted, and whether on the basis of it we can establish the word ἀρθρέμβολος ‘dislocating’ – why should this not be ἀρθρέμβολον in apposition to ὄργανον? βηρύλλιον is rightly asserted by the lexicon to be listed in LSJ – but then it should not appear in App. 1. iii. B. διεξίπταμαι is printed for διεξίπταμαι. Giving ἐγχειρίδιος ‘hand-held’ as the basic meaning of ἐγχειρίδιον ‘dagger’ is misleading: the etymological reading was possible in Aeschylus’ day (cf. *Suppl.* 21) but hardly in the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. To exclude ἐλαττονέω on the grounds that it is found in 2Cor.8:14 seems extraordinary, given that this is a LXX quotation – strictly speaking, this should not be in an NT glossary. The form ζώσος must be an error (I assume for ζώσας, which I do not find in any account of the Greek verb); the only example quoted (Gen.1:20) has the present participle. The genitive ἱρεως from ἱρις, judging from LSJ, is extremely rare, and need not be cited here. κόθωνος is wrongly alphabetised in App.1.III.A. I was interested to discover the reading καταλήγω at 2Macch.7:30 but do not understand why a false reading was given its own entry in the lexicon. For κείνος read κείνος and ἐκείνος (accent errors are not uncommon in Greek quoted within lemmata), for κώδιον read κώδιον. μακροημέρευσις is in the text of LSJ, not the *Suppl.* ὀροφοκοιτέω contra the text is mentioned in LSJ, if only as a *v.l.* (this is nonetheless a matter of text, not lexicography); Chamberlain has a tendency to list unlikely variants (αἶρεμα for example is ‘not in LSJ’ because its occurrence in the LXX is a corruption). ῥίζωμα of the sea in Job 36:30 might be related the use of the same word as ‘element’ (referring to physical masses of earth, fire, wind, and water) in Empedocles (D.-K. 31 B6.1). σημείον has a gloss in LSJ ‘point of time’ in technical writings on music; this seems exactly the sense required by Gen. 1:14. σκεύασις is attested also in genuine Plato. Why are στραγγαλιώδης and στραγγαλώδης divided, if they are *variae lectiones*? Since στραγγαλώδης does not seem to appear elsewhere, why has this reading been preferred? στριφνός is an adjective, not a noun (or if interpreted as such, should be listed as a reading without parallel in the appendix). συγκλυσμός is in LSJ, contra the text of the lexicon, but the word does not figure in App. 1. iii. A. ὑπερασπίστρια is in LSJ, and there is no indication to the contrary in the lexicon, but the word is listed in App. 1. iii. Is Proclus cited as the first attestation of φιλεχθρέω because he is quoting Ptolemy? The paradigm of χοῦς in the third century is a mix of two earlier paradigms (χοεύς and χόος), inflected according to an innovative pattern (on the analogy of βοῦς); giving Aristophanes as an antecedent is somewhat misleading.

The work, in short, is uneven. It is not clear to this reviewer that first time readers of the LXX will find it terribly useful; for that, they must await a larger work, or use one already available. An LXX dictionary is a complex undertaking aiming to fulfil a number of tasks: an account of the Hebricity of the language of the LXX, as well as its Hellenicity, must be given; textual problems of copying and translation must be addressed; the testimony of pagan sources must be weighed. All of these problems are broached in this volume, but none are carried through to completion, though the preface reads like a first draft of a promising monograph on LXX Greek (the word-lists in the Appendices, likewise, resemble the sort of collection that might precede the composition of such a monograph). The book,

in short, is of limited usefulness. We will do better, for the moment, to follow LSJ, whilst keeping an open mind about its limitations.

Ben Cartlidge

Trinity College, Oxford