The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Thackeray's *Old Testament Grammar A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint.*
By H. St. J. Thackeray, M.A. Vol. I., Introduction, Orthography and Accidence. Cambridge University Press, 1909. Pp. xx + 325.

James Hope Moulton

The Classical Review / Volume 24 / Issue 02 / March 2010, pp 52 - 55
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00044413, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00044413

How to cite this article:

James Hope Moulton (2010). The Classical Review, 24, pp 52-55 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00044413

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

REVIEWS

THACKERAY'S OLD TESTAMENT GRAMMAR.

A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint. By H. St. J. THACKERAY, M.A. Vol. I., Introduction, Orthography and Accidence. Cambridge University Press, 1909. Pp. xx + 325.

THE appearance of the new Septuagint Grammar is an event of the first importance for the rapidly growing study of Hellenistic vernacular Greek. It has of course great value for theological students, but on this side I need say nothing here, reserving it for some comments in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Jan. 1910). Mr. Thackeray's book is, as a matter of fact, of even greater significance for the philologist. For the first time we have the Septuagint systematically treated as an immense repository of Κοινή Greek, in constant connexion with the other Κοινή materials which the work of papyrologists and epigraphists has made available. I must pause a moment to qualify the *Priorität* which the phrase just used has suggested. Dr. Robert Helbing, of Karlsruhe, has managed to beat Mr. Thackeray by a few months in the race for this honour. His Grammar is a good piece of work, much better than would be supposed from the reading of Professor Wackernagel's one-sided review;¹ here the equally high authority of Professor Thumb² will serve to correct a condemnation based too much on details. But Thackeray's work, written in complete independence of it, is beyond comparison the fuller and more valuable of the two. It comes from a scholar already well known for remarkably acute and laborious work upon the different translators to be recognised among the books of the LXX, and in some cases within the limits of a single book. The results of this pioneer research are included in the Grammar before us, with a general sketch of the linguistic position of the LXX among the monuments of Hellenistic Greek, and a full

analysis of its words and forms as witnessed by the uncial MSS. To collect all this is a sufficiently noteworthy achievement for 'the very limited leisure of a civil servant' during eight years; and it becomes little less than marvellous when we add the exhaustive examination of the papyri and modern literature on Hellenistic grammar to which this volume bears witness. There are many other general comments that may be made on the book, but I must restrict myself here to a comment on the excellent style which the inheritor of a great literary name has been able to use even in a grammar, and the interesting touches that forbid the reader from skipping even such unpromising sections as that on the transliteration of proper names.

I proceed to a few points of detail. There is an interesting generalisation in the Preface (p. ix) upon the changes in Greek style which may be observed concurrently in the LXX books of successive periods and the contemporary papyri. The Pentateuch and Isaiah are good Common Greek, like the Petrie and the Hibeh papyri; the later prophets and the historical books reflect 'the more degenerate style of the papyri of the end of the second century B.C. (e.g. the Tebtunis collection).' A third period sees the rise of Atticism in the latest LXX books (so far as they escape the opposite tendency that produced pedantically literal versions), and in the literature of the school that finds its climax in Lucian. I pass by, in this review, most of the sections which deal with the relations of LXX Greek to its Hebrew original, only expressing my general satisfaction in Mr. Thackeray's treatment of the burning question of 'Hebraisms.' On one point I might add a word, the use of προστιθέναι (or the middle) c. inf. in the sense of the finite verb with πάλιν. That the frequency of this in the LXX (109 exx., see p. 53) is due to direct imitation of the Hebrew no one will question. But that it was hopelessly unidiomatic in Common Greek is not quite so certain. W. Schmidt years ago noted in Josephus

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, December, 1908 (No. 23).

² *Wochenschrift f. Kl. Philologie*, August 14th, 1908.

two examples of *προστίθεσθαι* c. inf. = *pergere* as the only Hebraisms to be detected in that blameless stylist—'id quod in eo ut in homine Judaeo imprimis laudandum est.'¹ To this Helbing (p. iv) has now added an example from pseudo-Callisthenes (ii. 41), οὐκέτι οὖν προσεθέμην ἀδύνατα ἐπιχειρεῖν. The fact that this 'Hebraism' stands alone in Josephus might be taken as decisive. We must, I think, hold that *προστίθεσθαι* (middle only) in this sense was idiomatic, though rare in the spoken *Κοινή*: the extensions found in the LXX are real Hebraisms, and the frequency of the use there stands with the other cases in which a correct locution is overdone because of its agreement with the translator's original. Mr. Thackeray's remarks (p. 56) on the accumulation of papyrus materials even since the appearance of my *Prolegomena* may be capped with the note that since his own book was written the Berlin editors have dropped a considerable collection of Alexandrian papyri from the reign of Augustus into the 'rather unfortunate gap' of i./B.C. and the first half of i./A.D., in which the papyri are 'sadly scanty.'² The remark still remains true, but the new material illustrates how rapidly our detailed work in Hellenistic grammar and lexicography comes in need of adaptation to fresh facts. The earliest dated papyrus is now no longer P. Hibeh 84 (as stated on p. 56), but P. Eleph. 1, but not in Mr. Thackeray's hands in time. On the next page (57 n.) it is said that the formula *ἐρρωσθαί σε εὖχομαι* is 'extended in iv./A.D. by the addition of πολλοῖς χρόνοις.' But the Berlin papyrus 892 has this addition, and it is two centuries older than the period named (see the *Nachträge* for date). There may be other examples, but I have not looked farther. Immediately after this comes a fine piece of critical work on the history of the form οὐθείς *et sim.* Statistics are given from the papyri which answer well to those from Attic inscriptions in Meisterhans-Schwyzler,³ and

prove that οὐθείς was a fashion that arose early in iv./B.C. and finally vanished with the close of ii./A.D., being in almost exclusive use between 300 and 132 B.C. In N. T. times οὐθείς was virtually extinct. The exactness of dating that is possible here gives us an admirable test of the accuracy with which our MSS. reflect their autographs. In taking up my test-form *τεσσαράκοντα*, which is less favourable to the uncials than οὐθείς, Mr. Thackeray (p. 73) agrees independently with Helbing (p. 7) in assuming a phonetic basis, due to the influence of the ρ. On δυνῖν (p. 92) the interesting explanation of Brugmann (*Gr. Gramm.*³ 55) should be noted: it seems more probable than that given here. A note of Wackernagel's may be brought in for the 2 aor. imper. pass. in -τι for -θῖ. Like Helbing, Mr. Thackeray does not mention *ἐπιστράφητι* (cf. p. 104), which Wackernagel says is regular in the first hand of B: he regards this Attic form as significant, showing that -θῖ was dissimilated in 2nd aor. after an aspirate, as well as in 1st aor. The other imperatives in -τι which are given here (not by Helbing) show how the analogy spread. On p. 124 Mr. Thackeray begins an instructive section on the curious irregular aspiration of which ἐφ' ἐλπίδι, καθ' ἔτος, ἀφιδεῖν, καθ' ἰδίαν, ἐφ' ἔσση, οὐχ ὀλίγος are typical examples. I am quite willing to be convinced that the long-lost digamma was an accessory here, if no better explanation turns up. But let it be noted that if any dialect was responsible, it is more likely to be Ionic than any other: note the formula ἐφ' ἔσση καὶ ὁμοίῃ, and the fact that Ionic had a habit of shifting aspirations within words. And of course Ionic had incomparably more influence on the *Κοινή* than any other dialect except (*longo intervallo*) Attic. Now, digamma disappeared in Ionic and Attic long before our oldest inscriptions begin; while in the dialects that kept *F* the substitution of *h* is far from normal in the words concerned. No device will get a digamma into οὐχ ὄψομαι (cf. Hesych. ἐφόπτῃς, and inscrip-tional ὕφοψίαν), or into ὀλίγος, for which Mr. Thackeray's ingenious suggestion seems hardly workable; and there are other cases of irregular aspiration in which no digamma

¹ *De Flavi Josephi elocutione* (1893), p. 517.

² *Griechische Urkunden aus den kön. Museen zu Berlin*. Band iv., Hefte 6-9 (1908-10).

³ Where οὐθείς is absent 'for over 250 years (300-60 B.C.).' There is a weak spot in the arithmetic here, I ween.

ever existed. To make this theory probable, we should have to find dialects in which aspirated forms can be shown to have been used in succession to a lost digamma, and then we must find a bridge from these dialects into the Κοινή. Meanwhile we note the great value of Mr. Thackeray's additional evidence from the LXX uncials, which strikingly agrees with that accumulated hitherto from inscriptions and papyri and the relics still left in Modern Greek. Of equal value is the material collected (pp. 141 ff.) as to the flexion of words in *-ρᾱ* and *-υῖα*. The evidence given as to the time when *-ρης* and *-υῖης* respectively became normal is very valuable for the marking of periods in the Κοινή.

On the supposed metaplasmus in the flexion of πύλη (p. 58) both our LXX grammarians seem to have exposed themselves to Wackernagel's criticism (on Helbing, p. 49) that τῇ πύλει, ταῖς πύλεσιν in A must be recognised as mere itacisms because of the feminine article. The discussion of the recurring πᾶν in seemingly masculine use (pp. 174 f.) is acute and full. Helbing (p. 51) compares it with the indeclinable use of ἡμῖν and πλήρης (on which note Thackeray's acute discussion on pp. 176 f.); while Thackeray would make it a sort of neuter in apposition, starting from the 'idiomatic use of the neuter of persons' (πᾶν ἀρσενικόν, πᾶν πρωτότοκον, etc.). The latter might be compared with an idiomatic use characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, the faithful rendering of which has brought the Revisers a good deal of criticism. Thus in 17²⁴ πατήρ, ὁ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κάκεινοι ὧσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ and 17² ἵνα πᾶν ὁ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσει αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον we have just this collective use of the neuter singular which is noted for the LXX. It is hard to choose between Helbing's explanation and Thackeray's, and perhaps both forces contributed. The very curious forms εὐθής, etc., for εὐθύς (pp. 177 ff.) are ignored by Helbing. Wackernagel, in remarking this, suggests that they are started by the analogy of the very numerous adjective compounds of εὖ which end in *-ής*, with which εὐθύς coincides in dat. singular and plural: ἡμίονος, the regular gen. of ἡμῖνος, may also have helped. We add with

Thackeray the nom. and acc. plur. εὐθέεις, and note the parallel influence of the feminine εὐθεία in producing the new genitive plural εὐθείων and neuter εὐθεία. By the way, Mr. Thackeray might be supposed to have left out one form in his declension of this word: the regular gen. εὐθέων is cited in Hatch-Redpath for Ps. 110¹, and is mentioned by Wackernagel, who seems to have trusted that marvellously accurate concordance for once too far—εὐθ(ε)ίων alone appears in Swete's uncials. The sad consequences of being too trustful show themselves in a note on p. 188, where Mr. Thackeray has taken from me the statement that Codex Bezae never writes δώδεκα. I in my turn got it from Wellhausen—*clarum et venerabile nomen!* But I ought to have verified my references for all that: I have found δώδεκα since in the MS. at Matt. 11¹ and elsewhere.

There is an interesting point made on p. 197 as to the dropping of the syllabic augment, which is confined to words in which the ε would have been unaccented: M.Gr. ἔγραψα, γράψαμε, are given as a parallel. The remark is significant, not only as supplying one more example of the striking anticipations of M.Gr. in the early Hellenistic period, but because of its bearing on the change of the Greek accent from pitch to stress. A note of Wackernagel's (on Helbing, 78) must be brought in to correct the statement that ἑώρακα 'appears to be the older Attic form,' as against ἑόρακα, which 'is certain in old comedy, and may have been always the vernacular form' (p. 204). W. emphatically asserts that ἑόρακα is the only genuine Attic, the other form being a Hellenistic assimilation to the imperfect. There is a slip on p. 233, where χαρήσομαι is called a future middle, instead of (formally) a passive. The note on ἀπεκρίθην (p. 239) gives us the interesting fact that the old ἀπεκρινάμην survives rarely in solemn or poetical language. It happens that my own notes from papyri of the imperial age made the middle form much the commoner. Mr. Thackeray's note prompted me to look up the passages again, with the noteworthy result that all the quotations turned out to be from legal documents: ἀποκρίνασθαι in the N. T. and in later papyri seems

always to suggest *formal* reply, either actually in court or under conditions comparable with these. It is not quite correct to call *νίπτω* 'the Ionic present from which the tenses are formed' (p. 277); *νίζω* and *νίψομαι* have alike the regular treatment of the velar in the root, and *νίπτω* is simply re-made by analogy. On *οἶμαι* (p. 279) it might be added that the forms without *ο* can be cited from papyri; and on *-φάυσکو*

(p. 288) that the N. T. has the future. There are a few other gleanings that I might add on points of detail, but these will suffice to illustrate the many-sided interest of an acute and most accurate book for all who think Greek worth studying in the period which we shall, I hope, soon cease calling the period of its decline.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.

The Gospel According to St. John. The Greek Text, with Introduction and Notes, by the late BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Durham, sometime Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. London: John Murray, 1908. Demy 8vo. 2 Vols. Pp. cxcvi + 283; 394. 24s. net.

THE circumstances under which this work has been published necessarily make the reviewer's task less easy, and this the more, the livelier sense he has of what his own mental development owes to other work of the author. Bishop Westcott's Commentary on the English text of St. John's Gospel has been before the world for thirty years. Its publication was an interlude in his preparation for the present work, and he continued, so far as other duties permitted, to study, meditate, and write for his edition of the Greek text. Unfortunately, nine chapters have received no further treatment than is supplied by a few occasional notes; the remaining twelve chapters have been re-annotated. The introduction is verbatim the same, except for expansion of the section on Old Testament quotations. It would be unfair, therefore, and unnecessary to criticise those views which have been already so long before the world, and in respect of which this book may properly be considered to be merely a new edition of the previously published *Speaker's Commentary*. Thus the Bishop's well-known interpretation of *ἀντλήσατε νῦν* in ii. 8 receives no new support, and since scholars have long ago decided severally to accept or reject it, there is little use in pointing out

here that the reasons for that view are with one exception disposed of if we take the commentator's second alternative and suppose that the water became wine as it passed from the stone jars into the pitchers. In the stone jar it was water: it was found to be wine in the pitcher. The single exception is the question of the use proper to *ἀντλεῖν*, and for this it must suffice to refer to Dr. Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary*, § 1710.

The extent to which the re-annotated chapters have been changed or amplified, if it may be gauged by an examination of the fourth chapter, proves to be very small. A few quotations from Origen and Rupert of Deutz almost complete the list of additions.

An illustration of the narrow limits, within which even the revised chapters must be regarded as accurately reflecting the author's final judgment, is supplied by the treatment of the familiar *οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμός ἐρχεται*; (iv. 35). Here an additional note at the end of the chapter tells us that 'Bishop Westcott had placed inside the pages of his copy of St. John's Gospel a letter published in the *Tablet* (December 23, 1899).' The writer of this letter declares: 'My contention is . . . that . . . the disciples must have remarked that the crop before their eyes was *four months old*,' and the editor, who thinks that 'it may be concluded that "the Bishop" considered the "new translation" worthy of consideration,' remarks as to the *ἔτι* (which is fatal to this interpretation) that Griesbach omits it 'on very fair authority, including the MSS. D and L.' But the Bishop's own