The book is marked by an unacceptable level of errors; what follows is not an exhaustive list. The indication of first attestation are highly unreliable: ἄγρια is first attested in Manender of Ephesus (quoted by Josephus), not Menander of Athens; likewise ἀδέλφιδος is first attested in Alcman, not Herodotus; ἦγος is first attested in the HomHymnMerc.410; ἀτιότον first in Pherocrates, not on papyri or inscriptions; ἄτικμοι in Xenophon, not Aristotle; κυνικός is indeed first reliably attested in Menander, but there means ‘Cynic (philosopher)’, not ‘dog-like’; κωλή (in the earlier form κωλή) is

1 παταχρός is not treated by M. Brust Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen (Innsbruck 2008).
first attested in Xenophanes (6th c. B.C.), not Aristophanes; ὅτα 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. ἄθετήμα, and 'inscriptions') (e.g. ἄγορασμός,) 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. ἀγνασμός). The entry on ἀνάσπτημα 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 ὀ 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 ἄρθρεμβολος ‘dislocating’ – why should this not be ἄρθρεμβολον in apposition to ὁγαγον; βηρώλλιον is rightly asserted by the lexicon to be listed in LSJ – but then it should not appear in App. 1. iii. B. διεξήπταμα is printed for διεξήπταμα. 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 3rd c. To exclude ἔλαττονέω 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 ἵππως from ἵππος, 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 κατάλγην at 2Macch.7:30 but do not understand why a false reading was given its own entry in the lexicon. For κέννασιν προκειμένος and ἐκκέννος (accent errors are not uncommon in Greek quoted within lemmata), for κόδιον read κόδιον. μακροκέρασις is in the text of LSJ, not the Suppl. ὁροφοκοκτέω 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 (ἁρμέμα 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). σημαινόν has a gloss in LSJ ‘point of time’ in technical writings on music; this seems exactly the sense required by Gen. 1:14. σκώμα is attested also in genuine Plato. Why are στραγγαλώδης and στραγγαλώδης divided, if they are variae lectiones? Since στραγγαλώδης does not seem to appear elsewhere, why has this reading been preferred? στριμών is an adjective, not a noun (or if interpreted as such, should be listed as a reading without parallel in the appendix). συγκλοσμός is in LSJ, contra the text of the lexicon, but the word does not figure in App. 1. iii. A. ὑπερασπίσται 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 φιλεχθρία 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 Hebrivity 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.
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