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](#)

Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek A Grammar of New Testament Greek based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar*. By James Hope Moulton, M.A. (Cantab.), D.Lit. (Lond.). T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh, 1906. 8vo. Vol. I. Prolegomena. Pp. xx + 274. 8s. net.

T. Nicklin

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 09 / December 1906, pp 464 - 466

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00995350, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00995350

How to cite this article:

T. Nicklin (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 464-466 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00995350

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

contained the same amount as in the 26-line MSS. is at least a partial *petitio principii*. The transposition could equally well be explained by the inversion of a single leaf in a minuscule MS. which would contain (within, say, 8 per cent.) much the same amount of text as a leaf of L itself.

Besides the text itself other matters of interest contained in the MS. receive elucidation in this edition. Mr. R. L. Poole has spent much labour upon the curious fifteenth-

century scholia, which contain quotations from a singularly wide range of literature, though nothing very definite can be made out as to their author. A sixteenth-century owner, Jean du Tillet, is the subject of a long appendix by Mr. C. H. Turner. Lastly, we must not omit to mention facsimiles from the Udine and Paris MSS. which serve to supply the portion of the text which is missing in the Oxford MS.

J. P. GILSON.

MOULTON'S GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

A Grammar of New Testament Greek based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar. By JAMES HOPE MOULTON, M.A. (Cantab.), D.Lit. (Lond.). T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh, 1906. 8vo. Vol. I. Prolegomena. Pp. xx+274. 8s. net.

AMONG serious students of the New Testament, scarcely one probably could be found in England to-day who does not owe an inestimable debt to Winer's Grammar, and in particular to the English translation or rather revision of it by the late Dr. W. F. Moulton. Only in the backwaters of solitary studies have earlier works kept their place. Two generations have benefited by what in its special province marked an epoch as much as Liddell and Scott's Lexicon. Now a son sets forth to do for this age what his father did for the last.

His success may be measured by the appearance, within seven months, of a second edition, with corrections and additions running to ten pages of matter. From the title-page of this edition the claim to connexion with the old book has been rightly deleted.

It is not without reason that Dr. J. H. Moulton on his very first page speaks to his readers of 'a change in our conceptions of the subject nothing less than revolutionary.' The importance of this change, and of justifying it, is in reality what has called this preliminary volume forth. Following Deismann, the author has abandoned the conception that the Greek of the New Testament writings is in essence Hebraic or Aramaic: he believes it to be merely 'Common' or 'Hellenistic' Greek of the non-literary kind. Readers of the *Classical Review* will be not unprepared for this

pronouncement. A number of invaluable papers, it will be remembered, have appeared from Dr. Moulton's pen, tracing in the various volumes of papyri which have been already published, parallels to nearly every construction hitherto explained as 'translation' or 'Biblical' Greek. That some such view should one day emerge was probably in any case to be expected as soon as grammarians had extended their outlook to the phenomena of the English language as it is now diffused through distant continents. The late Greek world presented many features of resemblance to the English civilisation. It was natural to guess that analogies would be discoverable between the two universal languages. The evidence of the papyri has confirmed the correctness of these conjectures.

The sweep of this theory will be surmised when it is said that Dr. Moulton believes that in scarcely a single instance can it be positively asserted that a phrase or construction in the Septuagint or New Testament is directly due to literal translation. All, he contends, are turns which can be paralleled by pure Greek,—only their frequency he allows to be due to their similarity to idioms in Aramaic. Thus the entire treatment of the New Testament Grammar becomes altered, and this, as he points out, involves in many cases alteration in the exegesis of particular passages.

So cardinal is this issue that I shall make no apology for bestowing a disproportionate amount of space upon its consideration.¹ It must be allowed that the parallel of spoken English—in substance identical, widely dissimilar in particulars—as men of

¹ I gather from pp. 241-2 that Wellhausen must have made a similar criticism, and the author acknowledges that 'we must be on our guard.'

various counties, classes, countries, and nationalities use it, suggests many useful reflexions. Dr. Moulton *e.g.* observes that the Welshman's 'look you' and 'indeed' show that a bilingual people do not translate into absolutely incorrect language, but overdo the use of a possible expression because it occurs frequently in the other language they speak. This is true. 'Even the Greek of the Apocalypse itself,' Dr. Moulton urges, 'does not seem to owe any of its blunders to Hebraism,' and he explains its peculiarities as almost altogether due to the want of Greek education, to illiteracy so far as Greek is concerned. This again seems to satisfy the conditions of the question, and the author's argument might have been strengthened, if he had pointed out that one of the regular consequences when a foreigner learns a language orally and not at all grammatically is an inclination to slur over case-endings and other inflexions. When such a man is under the necessity of writing the foreign language, this ignorance of the inflexions—slurred over in speech—betrays itself unmistakably.

So far Dr. Moulton's thesis seems to be not only illuminating but sound. His further contentions cause dubiety. To establish that many of the New Testament constructions are not merely 'Biblical' or 'Semitic' but 'illiterate Common Greek,' that they are thoroughly Greek in stamp, though not in frequency, he has not seldom to rely upon one or two isolated parallels from papyri or inscriptions. The comparison of English must occasion misgivings. It is said that a Yorkshireman to the second generation is betrayed by his use of 'bucket' and 'pail.' An Irishman to the second generation certainly discovers himself by the form of his indirect questions. The use of 'while' for 'until,' 'just now,' of 'tart' and 'pie,' of 'hand' or 'finger' in a clock, are all variations derivable from local origin. The speech of the nursery-maid necessarily invades the speech of her charges: we may be sure that the language of the *παιδαγωγός* left its mark on Greek boys. A man whom I met very far from the Welsh borders and of whose nationality I had not then the slightest suspicion, ended an occasional sentence with 'isn't it?' More instances might easily be put together; but probably everyone on consideration will allow not only that the use of a provincial word or the choice of a particular word amongst several synonyms often persists after a family has migrated, but that an idiom, such as the stereotyped 'isn't it?' after statements of

all forms, often does so, and that mimicry and imitation often produce a lasting effect on a man's natural idiom. Thus Scotchmen who settle in England soon lose their natural aspirate, and a Suffolk servant-girl who has once taken service in a town returns home 'h'-less. A lively Irish boy's use of 'will' is quickly caught up by others till it seems correct. If we apply this analogy to Greek, we are led to expect that, especially amongst the less educated, local differences would exist. On this point Dr. Moulton is alive to the possibility, for he writes:—

'Are we to expect persistence of Ionic features in Asia Minor; and will the Greek of Egypt, Syria, Macedonia, and Italy differ to an extent which we can detect after two thousand years? Speaking generally, we may reply in the negative. Dialectic differences there must have been in a language spoken over so large an area. But they need not theoretically be greater than those between British and American English, to refer again to the helpful parallel we examined above (p. 19). We saw there that in the modern *Weltsprache* the educated colloquial closely approximates everywhere when written down, differing locally to some extent, but in vocabulary and orthography rather than in grammar. The uneducated vernacular differs more, but its differences still show least in the grammar. The study of the papyri and the *Κοινή* inscriptions of Asia Minor discloses essentially the same phenomena in Hellenistic. There are few points of grammar in which the N.T. language differs from that which we see in other specimens of Common Greek vernacular. from whatever province derived' (p. 39).

That we can hardly hope to trace with certainty the dialectic differences in the Common Greek may be readily allowed; but Dr. Wright would probably deny that in the uneducated vernacular English the grammatical differences were less than other differences, and Dr. Moulton hardly does justice to his own parallel unless he expects theoretically considerable differences between much of the New Testament and the illiterate writers of papyri, since except St. Luke and St. Paul we may suppose the Biblical writers to have been illiterate or at least non-literary. It would be better then to say we should theoretically expect greater differences between the New Testament and the illiterate papyri than between the educated writers of the *Κοινή*. Now, if theoretically we are to expect dialect in

illiterate Κοινή, it is reasonable to interpret Dr. Moulton's rarer parallels from the papyri in a very different way from that which he adopts. We know, generally speaking, nothing of the ethnological origin, the educational environment, or the associates of those who wrote these isolated documents. We cannot therefore safely rely upon one or two instances of any construction, however remote from one another the places where the papyri recording them may be, as establishing the genuinely Greek character of that construction. The writer may be the grandson of a Semite; he may have had a Syrian παιδαγωγός; he may have mimicked a Jew tradesman till the idiom became second nature to himself. Allow for these possibilities, make these corrections and deductions in the argument, and we are brought back, although with a wider and more historical view of the subject, to something not very unlike the old theory of 'Biblical' or 'Aramaic' Greek.

Similarly Thumb's remark, quoted by Dr. Moulton in a footnote to page 17, that 'what appears Hebraism or Aramaism in the Bible must count as Greek if it shows itself as a natural development in the Modern Greek vernacular' needs great care in its application, for undoubtedly the English Authorised Version has influenced the type of dialect which has prevailed, even in the matter of grammatical inflexion and construction, and it is to be expected that the Greek Bible had no less influence over Greek from say 300–800 A.D.

Little less fundamental for Dr. Moulton's purpose is his discussion of the Greek Tense-systems, where he distinguishes 'punctiliar' action, whether 'ingressive,' 'effective,' or 'constative,' from 'linear' or 'durative,' and from 'perfect' and 'iterative.' When the terminology has become familiar, these distinctions should be found of great service. They will assist in clearing up the question of the propriety of the course taken by the Revisers of the English translation in replacing perfects by aorists. The truth of the matter is, as Dr. Moulton hints, that each passage needs to be examined by itself without any predetermination. When the particular use of the Greek tense has been defined, then and not till then should the English equivalent be looked for. To treat all Greek aorists as transferable without distinction into the English aorist is as illegit-

imate as to treat them all as transferable into the English perfect.

I should have liked to have dealt with some other questions, but space does not permit. I must content myself with a few bald statements. I cannot remember when I did not know the distinction between prohibitions in Greek put by the aorist subjunctive and present imperative, and I fancy all who have been in the Sixth form at Shrewsbury would say the same. I had no conception that we were singular in this knowledge till I saw Dr. Walter Headlam's paper some years ago.¹ Besides the common use of the present to mean 'Desist from,' there is certainly another where 'Do not think of' gives the effect. The examples quoted by Mr. Naylor (*C.R.* xx. p. 348) are all explicable in this way. Undoubtedly Dr. Moulton is right (unless indeed his various uses are resolvable into two) when he writes 'Μὴ ποίει accordingly needs various mental supplements, and not one only. It is "Stop doing," or "Do not (from time to time)," or "Do not (as you are in danger of doing)," or "Do not attempt to do."'

In Acts xix. 16 where ἀμφότεροι appears to refer to ἐπὶ τοὺς Σκευᾶ, the 'relief' which Dr. Moulton desires might be obtained perhaps better than by making ἀμφότεροι mean πάντες, if we read ἡ τοῖς for οἱ τοῖς. (In the second edition a suggestion of Mr. J. B. Shipley is given that ἐπτά arose from a gloss, Σκευᾶ = שבע = ἐπτά.)

It may be worth while to suggest that the combination of aorist with perfect is a Hellenistic trick of style, sometimes perhaps due, as the author once suggests (p. 145), to the defective tense-forms of a verb, more often to an effort to express the force of an English perfect without the proper Greek meaning—the aorist serving to warn the reader that he must deduct from the full sense of the perfect.

This work must necessarily exercise a controlling influence over the English study of the New Testament for many years, and give it an impulse and direction that will long endure. It is, for this reason, the more urgently desirable that its foundations should be soundly laid, and, I venture to believe, some of its basic propositions reconsidered.

T. NICKLIN.

¹ *C.R.* xvii. 295.