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](#)

Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary* *Johannine Vocabulary. A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with those of the Three.* By Edwin A. Abbott. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1905. Demy 8vo. Pp. xviii + 364. 13s. 6d. net.

T. Nicklin

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 03 / April 1906, pp 172 - 175

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00994204, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00994204

How to cite this article:

T. Nicklin (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 172-175 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00994204

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the year 310, probably in Athens, and perhaps by a Peripatetic.

The application and cumulative confirmation of this hypothesis takes up the greater part of the book. Mr. Boas investigates minutely the authorities for the extant epigrams, distinguishing derivatives of sources older than the Sylloge from derivatives, direct or indirect, of the Sylloge itself, and giving from time to time an elaborate stemma to illustrate the tradition of a particular epigram. Among much interesting matter I note that he rightly agrees with Hiller and Wilamowitz in denying that the authority of Aristides can be adduced in support of the ascription to Simonides of epigrams 90, 104, and 132 (Bergk).

Passing over all this mass of detail, I come to the fourth chapter, in which the author sums up his conclusions about the way in which the Sylloge was formed. The compiler drew from literary sources, especially from historians, and above all from Ephorus, who was fond of illustrative quotations.¹ Of the thirty-four poems which can be said with more or less certainty to have had a place in the Sylloge, only two, so far as we know, were coupled with the name of Simonides in the compiler's authorities; in three other cases the lines themselves contain the poet's name; in the rest he was guided only by his private judgment. Whether he included as many epigrams referring to the Persian wars as he could lay hands on, or how many he rejected, we cannot say; but his inclusion of three poems which deal with events later than the death of Simonides shews no great caution or care. Other poems gained admission by virtue of their mention of persons with whom the poet was known to have had to do. In eleven poems the compiler seems to have altered

the text, wishing either to emend a corruption, or to bring the diction into harmony with other pieces of his collection, or to change the purport. An example of the last motive is the poem *φημὶ Γέλων* 'Ἰέρωνα, written for the four tripods dedicated at Delphi after Himera by the four sons of Deinomenes; this he rewrote in sympathy with the tradition which spoke of one tripod only, the gift, not of the four brothers, but of Gelon. In such cases, where two versions are extant, editors usually offer us hybrid texts; and Mr. Boas utters a salutary warning: 'editors of the epigrams must keep the older tradition apart from that which is derived from the Sylloge'; to which he adds that 'editors of the authors in whom Simonidean poems are quoted must give the text which was used by the author himself.'

A short history of the career of the Sylloge from its birth to the time of Planudes concludes a book which is both constructively important and invaluable as a treasure-house of facts. The last page gives a welcome foretaste of what we are to expect from the second part of the work. 'In ea autem lectoribus me persuasurum esse spero Simonidem revera et fuisse summae artis epigrammaticum poetam et floruisse apud aequales summa poetae epigrammatici laude; quam ei viri clarissimi Kaibel atque Wilamowitz iniuria denegaverunt, cum epigrammata omnia, quae in traditione cum Simonide coniuncta sint, ei adimenda esse intellegerent.' The Sylloge will be found to have contained a few poems by Simonides; some written by other poets for inscriptions; and 'demonstrative' epigrams which were never engraved on stone. 'Epigrammata autem Simonidea, quae primo generi adiudicanda mihi videntur praeter tria epp. Thermopylensia, sunt octo.' We shall await with interest the credentials of these eight mice.

E. HARRISON.

¹ Strabo, p. 464 (x. ch. 3, § 5, last sentence).

ABBOTT'S JOHANNINE VOCABULARY.

Johannine Vocabulary. A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with those of the Three. By EDWIN A. ABBOTT. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1905. Demy 8vo. Pp. xviii + 364. 13s. 6d. net.

DR. ABBOTT is able to continue the publication of his *Diatessarica* with enviable

regularity, and the latest volume of the series shows no falling off in the quality of his work. Indeed to say this only would be a crass understatement of the truth: for in this *Johannine Vocabulary* we have work that every clergyman and every one interested in the Greek Testament should at once procure and set to work to study. The author's theory of a Hebrew Gospel trans-

lated with variants and corrections and adscripts to make our Synoptists does not here creep out. We have only a solid piece of work on the vocabulary of the Gospels, distinguished however from the mere statistician's figures and lists by the subtle and ingenious reflexions continually made. A century ago Tittmann did good pioneer work on the synonyms of the New Testament, and Archbishop Trench's book is known, of course, to everyone. But Dr. Abbott shows—and once the reader has his eyes thus opened, he is astounded that he was so long blind—that there is an infinite deal still to be observed and interpreted in the very language of the New Testament writers. It would be unfair to the author to extract the fine flowers of his scholarship instead of sending readers to his book, but as a sample of what there awaits them may be mentioned that notice is called to the two constructions used with *προσκυνεῖν*, and the distinction in sense between them is then drawn out. That this is no trifling pedantry and hair-splitting scholarship will be seen by anyone who will take the trouble to look at St. John *Gospel* 4²²⁻²⁴ or St. Matthew 4⁹⁻¹⁰.

It must not be assumed, however, that Dr. Abbott is uniformly successful in his interpretations of the facts. His lists and stimulating comments will be found invaluable by many who will not be convinced by his statements. He is indeed a little hide-bound by the unconscious assumption (which he would as cordially reject as anyone if consciously brought face to face with it) that the Greek accessible to the Evangelists is confined to what we still have of ancient literature. It does no doubt require a distinct effort of the imagination to keep constantly in mind that these writers knew Greek more from hearing others speak it than from reading authors, and to use such authors as we have for testimony to the kind of Greek spoken or written when they wrote rather than for indicating the source from which this word or that has been culled. Yet students of the New Testament certainly do not always overcome the temptation to regard the sacred writers as virtually saying to themselves 'Go to, I will write another canonical book: for this end what words and phrases does the LXX supply?' An unconscious product of this naive conceit is to be found even in Dr. Abbott's book. He very rightly groups together Mark 15⁴⁶, Matt. 27⁵⁹, Luke 23⁵⁸, John 19⁴⁰, 20⁷ for the examination of the way in which *ἐνταλίσσω* is used; but he unfortunately sees in these

passages a proof that St. John 'accepts the rare word of Matthew and Luke as expressing a fact, though not exactly the fact they describe.'¹ The truth of the matter is that such arguments from the known occurrences of any word or phrase in Greek literature need at least one correction, viz. a correction according to the evidence from the period and place of any writer that he had or had not at his command any other equivalent word or phrase. In the absence of such evidence conclusions are perilous. Dr. Abbott discusses the uses of *πιστεύειν*, of *ἐξουσία*, and of synonyms like *ἀγαπᾶν* and *φιλεῖν*, and his discussions are invaluable. But when we ask if his conclusions are entirely sound, we are brought up by the apparent neglect of the correction that must, as has been said above, be applied. It is here that the assistance of other students is required. If everyone interested in the subject would take one of Dr. Abbott's suggestive observations, and pursue it home, substantial advances in the knowledge of Biblical Greek would be possible. The necessity of such work will be seen from one instance.

Dr. Abbott makes much of the fact that in the Fourth Gospel, often within the limits of one verse, words of different root are used to express the idea of *Seeing*. Fourteen months ago, stimulated by his work, I set out to investigate St. John's use in this respect, but from a very different standpoint. It had occurred to me that amongst the other vast changes which a language with a long history might exhibit, one might conceivably be the death amongst irregular verbs or nouns of the root-forms used in one age and the consequent adoption of other roots. English, I believed, would illustrate this, and I now know that the comparison *bad*, *worse*, *worst* is a very late substitute for *evil* (or *ill*), *worse*, *worst*, while *bad* does not appear till the 12th century, and then till about the 17th gives *badder*, *baddest*. In Attic Greek *ὁρῶ*, *ὄψομαι*, *εἶδον*, *έόρακα* are used as if of one root. Scholars brought up on Attic grammar by force of prejudice transfer this paradigm to the New Testament, note any variations in the form of these words, and write elaborate exegesis of any divergence in root from it. As a test of the validity of this proceeding, I here give first the actual facts of St. John's use, and will then enquire what light, if any, those facts may throw on doubtful passages.

¹ Still we may take it to be established that the Fourth Gospel is written allusively to the traditions recorded in the other Gospels.

St. John in his Gospel uses :

PRES. βλέπει (τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν) 1 § 29. βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἡρμένον 20 § 1. βλέπουνσιν ἀνθρακίαν κειμένην 21 § 9. τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου βλέπει 11 § 9. παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια, οὐ μέντοι εἰσῆλθεν 20 § 5. ἐπιστραφεὶς ὁ Πέτρος βλέπει τὸν μαθητὴν 21 § 20. βλέπω (I have eyesight) 9 §§ 15, 19, 20, 25, 39, 41. ἂν μὴ τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιούντα 5 § 19. βλέπων (= with eyesight) (blind) 9 §§ 7, 39 (*bis*) in 2 *Epr.* 8 βλέπετε ἑαυτοὺς ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.

and θεωροῦσιν (τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιπατοῦντα) 6 § 19. θεωρῶ (ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ 4 § 19) 12 § 19. θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐρχόμενον 10 § 12. ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμὲ θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με 12 § 45 14 § 17. ἔτι μικρὸν καὶ ὁ κόσμος με οὐκ ἐτι θεωρεῖ, ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτέ με 14 § 19, 16 §§ 10, 16 (see ὤψεσθε) 17, 19. ἐὰν θεωρῇτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα 6 § 62. ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι 17 § 24. θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει 2 § 23. οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον ὅτι προσαίτης ἦν 9 § 8. πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν 6 § 40, 12 § 45. θεωρεῖ τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα καὶ τὸ σουνδάριον . . . οὐ μετὰ τὸν ὀθονίων κείμενον 20 § 6 (see βλέπει). θεωρεῖ δύο ἀγγέλους 20 § 12, θεωρεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐστῶτα 20 § 14 and 1 *Epr.* 3 § 17 ὅς δ' ἂν θεωρῇ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχοντα.

IMPERF. θεωροῦν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει 6 § 2 (see ἰδόντες). ἔβλεπον εἰς ἀλλήλους 13 § 22.

FUTURE. ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὤψεσθε 1 § 38 (see εἶδαν). μεῖζω τούτων ὤψῃ 1 § 50. ὤψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεψγῶτα 1 § 51 (see τεθέαμαι perhaps).

[Ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου θεωρήσουσιν σου τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖς] 17 § 3.]

ὤψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ 11 § 40 μικρὸν καὶ οὐκ ἐτι θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὤψεσθέ με 16 § 16, 17, 19 (see θεωρεῖτε). πάλιν δὲ ὀψομαι ὑμᾶς 16 § 22.

AORIST. θεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ 1 § 14, θεασάμενος αὐτοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας 1 § 38 (see εἶδεν 1 § 47), θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας 4 § 35, θεασάμενος ὅτι πολλὸς ὄχλος ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτόν 6 § 5, θεασάμενοι ὃ ἐποίησεν 11 § 45; and 1 *Epr.* 1 § 1 ὃ ἐώρακαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ θεασάμεθα.

and θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα 8 § 51 (cf. εἶδεν Lk. 2 § 26 *Epr.* Hebr. 11 § 5).

and *indicative* ἦλθαν οὖν καὶ εἶδαν ποῦ μένει 1 § 39 (see ὤψεσθε), εἶδεν τὸν Ναθαναὴλ ἐρχόμενον 1 §§ 47 (see θεασάμενος 1 § 38), 48, 50, 11 § 33 εἶδον ὅτι πλουτάριον ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ 6 § 22, 24. εἶδετε σημεῖα 6 § 26, ἡγαλλιᾶσαστο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ εἶδεν 8 § 56. εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλόν 9 § 1. εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ 12 § 41. οὐκ ἐγὼ σε εἶδον ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μετ' αὐτοῦ; 18 § 26, 19 § 6 (cf. εἶδου) εἶδον ἤδη αὐτὸν τεθηγκότα

19 § 33, εἶδεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν 20 § 8 (see θεωρεῖ).

Subj. ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον 1 § 33 (see τεθέαμαι 1 § 32 and ἐώρακα 1 § 34). ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδῃτε 4 § 48, 6 § 30, 8 § 56. ἦλθαν ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἴδωσιν 12 § 9 [ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς 12 § 40 from the LXX]. ἐὰν μὴ ἴδω ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτὸν τὸν τύπον τῶν ἡλων 20 § 25 (see ἐώρακαμεν).

Imperat. ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε 1 § 46, 11 § 34, δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον 4 § 29, 20 § 27 ἐρευνήσον καὶ ἴδε ὅτι 7 § 52. In 1 *Epr.* 3 § 1 (cf. *Gospel* 11 § 36) ἴδετε ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατήρ and 5 § 16 ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα; and as an exclamation ἴδε ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ 1 §§ 29, 36, 47. 3 § 26, 5 § 14. 7 § 26, 11 § 3, 36, 12 § 19, 16 § 29, 18 § 21, 19 §§ 4, 14, 26 (*bis*). ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος 19 § 5 (see εἶδον) ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν 4 § 35 (12 § 15 from the LXX) 16 § 32.

Infinitive. οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ 3 § 3. θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν 12 § 21, and 3 *Epr.* 14.

Participle. τοῦτον ἰδὼν κατακείμενον 5 § 6, 19 § 26, ἰδόντες ἃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖα 6 § 14 (see ἐθεώρουν), ἰδόντες τὴν Μαριὰμ ὅτι ταχέως ἀνέστη 11 § 31, ἰδοῦσα αὐτόν 11 § 32, 20 § 20 (see ἐώρακαμεν) 21 § 21. ὅτι ἐώρακάς με πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες 20 § 29.

Besides ἐμβλέψας with the dative occurs in 1 §§ 36, 42.

PERFECT. Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἐώρακεν πώποτε 1 § 18, 5 § 37, 6 § 46 (*bis*) and 1 *Epr.* 4 § 20, 3 *Epr.* 11, ἀπ' ἄρτι γινώσκετε αὐτόν καὶ ἐώρακατε 14 §§ 7, 9, 15 § 24 and 1 *Epr.* 3 § 6. κἀγὼ ἐώρακα (see τεθέαμαι and ἴδῃς) 1 § 34, 3 §§ 11, 32, 19 § 35, and 1 *Epr.* 1 §§ 1, 2, 3. ἐώρακετε [με] καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε 6 § 36, 20 § 29. ἃ ἐγὼ ἐώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λαλῶ 8 § 38. καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἐώρακας; 8 § 57, 9 § 37. ἐώρακα τὸν κύριον 20 § 18 (see ἰδόντες and ἴδω) 25, and 1 *Epr.* 4 § 20. *Participle.* Πάντα ἐωρακότες ὅσα ἐποίησεν 4 § 45. ὃ ἐωρακὼς ἐμέ 14 § 9.

and τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περισσευόν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ 1 § 32. θεὸν οὐδεὶς πώποτε τεθέαται 1 *Epr.* 4 § 12. ἡμεῖς τεθεάμεθα καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν ὅτι ὁ πατήρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱὸν σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου § 14.

The significance of these facts *prima facie* is this: ὁρῶ *in the present* is *dead*, and *its place is taken by θεωρῶ or βλέπω*; *the future is unchanged*; *the aorist is still generally εἶδον, but sometimes θεασάμεν*; *the perfect ἐώρακα, sometimes τεθέαμαι*.¹

¹ Since this article was in type, I have noticed in Jannaris *Hist. Gk. Gram.* p. 270 'In N(eo-hellenic) ὁρῶ is replaced by θεωρῶ (i.e. θεωρῶ) and βλέπω.'

Taking this as the correct paradigm, we may draw one or two inferences. In 6 § 2 ἑώρων of **N** is by analogy not so likely to be St. John's word as ἐθεώρουν of ABDL. In 7 § 3 θεωρήσωσι of the common text is more likely than θεωρήσουσι, which presumably would be ὄψονται. In 19 § 26 ἴδε is more Johannine than ἰδοῦ of the common texts, and in 19 § 5 the common ἴδε should perhaps be read.

That the Johannine neglect of ὁρῶ is no isolated phenomenon may be seen by the fact that St. Luke uses it only thrice (*Gospel* 16 § 23, 23 § 49, *Acts* 8 § 23); *Epistle to the Hebrews* twice (2 § 8, 11 § 27); St. James 2 § 24; 1 *Peter* 1 § 8; *Apocalypse* 18 § 18. A doubtful example is St. Mark

8 § 24. Once or twice it has survived also in the phrase for 'beware.'

When we ask whether, as in Attic, ἀγαθός had several senses indistinguishable by the word while ἀριστος, βέλτιστος, κράτιστος expressed the distinction, so the parallel forms in our verb are distinguishable, there is more room for difference of opinion. To be brief, I suppose βλέπω always to imply the use of the eye, but to be conversational in tone, so that θεωρῶ is often preferred, though less specific: εἶδον to be conversational, but to be wide in meaning, ἐθεασάμην perhaps to insist on the use of the eye: and the perfects presumably to be distinguished similarly.

T. NICKLIN.

ARCHER-HIND'S GREEK VERSE AND PROSE TRANSLATIONS.

Translations into Greek Verse and Prose.

By R. D. ARCHER-HIND, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Large Crown 8vo. Pp. viii + 244. Price 6s. net.

THERE are probably very few scholars who after reading these versions will not be disposed to envy Mr. Archer-Hind not only his profound and extensive knowledge of Greek, but also his literary versatility. Not a few of the poems he translates are derived from German, Italian, and Spanish sources, and in his prose versions he shows himself as conversant with archaic English as with the style of Herodotus, in which he reproduces several quaint extracts from the works of Sir John Mandeville.

The prose versions cover a very wide field, ranging from simple narrative to philosophical disquisitions and dialogues from Berkeley, Shelley, Emerson, Edgar Allan Poe, Dr. George MacDonald, etc. As a further proof that the author's command of Greek is capable of coping with any theme however rebellious, we have a trade circular in which the 'Cambridge Scientific Company' intimates its removal to more commodious premises and informs prospective customers that it is,

'as it always has been, anxious rather to strike out or adopt and improve new forms of instruments than to direct its energies to the reproduction in a dealer's spirit of familiar and more or less stereotyped models.'

ἡ μὲν οὖν ἔταιρεία ἀεὶ τε καὶ νῦν πρόθυμός ἐστι καινουργίας τῶν μηχανῶν αὐτῇ τε ἐξευρίσκειν ἄλλων τε παραλαβούσα ἐξακριβῶσαι μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ γνώριμα καὶ δεδημευμένα εἶδη κατασκευάζουσα καπηλικῶς διαπνεύσθαι.

A still more brilliant *tour de force* is the report of a meeting of Argentine bondholders under the presidency of Lord Rothschild (Πυρρασπίδης). This report bristles with commercial technicalities, through which Mr. Archer-Hind threads his way with consummate ease and even, one would suppose, with a positive enjoyment of their intricacy. Lord Rothschild assures his hearers that

'the scheme of debt settlement ratified by the meeting is very simple' (ἀ δ' οὖν τοῖς τότε συλλεγεῖσιν κεκύρωται περὶ τῶν χρεῶν τάξεως οὐδὲν χαλεπὸν διασαφῆσαι, . . . προζήτητη γάρ, ὃν ἂν οἱ δημόσιοι ἡμῖν τραπεζῖται διὰ τῶν προβούλων καταστήσωσιν, ἀποστελεῖ ἐπὶ πέντε μὲν ἔτη ἡ Ἀργυραίων πόλις ἑπτακισχίλια τάλαντα κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν κ.τ.λ.), 'the Argentine Government will remit to an agent to be named by the Committee of the Bank of England the annual sum of £1,565,000 for five years.'

If anyone in fact wishes to realise the plasticity of ancient Greek and its adaptability to the most varied artificialities of modern terminology he cannot do better than study these versions. In only a single instance has the author coined a word (πεφωτογραφημένοι, p. 147), for even the expression ὁδοὶ σεσδιηρωμένοι ('railways') is good ancient Greek and much more descriptive than the modern Greek term σιδηροδρόμοι.

One of the most striking features of these versions is the effective way in which the sequence and correlation of ideas in the English original are elucidated in its Greek form by syntactical arrangement and the deft use of particles; with the result that