This should, of course, be the other way round, and this is indeed what we find in the second part, Volume III p. 2474, with no reference whatsoever to the first part: '*Πρίν . . . until* introduce[s] clauses [*sic*] whose action follows upon and is subsequent to the time of [its] principal', and similarly for ἐπεί ('. . . temporal clauses which precede their principal clause in time'), etc. The poor user who consults only the first part will have to live with the idea that the meaning of πρίν must be 'after'.

Misprints are legion, but rarely serious. Among the more serious ones is ἐξ οὗ for ἐς οὗ on p. 2475. The Bibliography in C., Part I hardly deserves that name. It is as if, with Krüger's death, the study of Greek syntax virtually came to an end. The Supplementary Bibliography in Volume IV is better, but why are e.g. W. F. Bakker, *The Greek Imperative*, L. Basset, *Les emplois périphrastiques du verbe grec μέλλειν*, and Ch. Kahn, *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek* lacking?

In sum: an ill-considered enterprise, and a very strange book.

University of Amsterdam A. RIJKSBARON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni265

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

J. A. L. Lee: *A History of New Testament Lexicography*. (Studies in Biblical Greek 8.) Pp. xiv + 414, ills. New York: Peter Lang, 2003. Paper, £28.99, US$39.95. ISBN: 0-8204-3480-9.

Lee is known for his standard work *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (Chico, CA, 1983). He is currently working with G. H. R. Horsley on *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament with Documentary Parallels*, to replace H. H. Moulton and G. Milligan's *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London, 1930). That work was inspired by the pioneering study of Adolf Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* [London, 1910]). Deissmann showed that New Testament Greek is not a special variety used by Jews of the Near East or by the Holy Spirit, but is largely the everyday *koine* of the first century. The impact of papyrus discoveries from the sands of Egypt links NT lexicography and the general history of classical scholarship.

The present work comprises a history of NT lexicons and their authors (with annotated bibliography), and case studies of a dozen words of disputed meaning. Demonstrations of persistent misunderstanding connect the second half with the first. L. does not spare his predecessors, though he is sympathetic to their difficulties. His account is sprightly in style and rich in human interest. The first chapter illustrates how long most lexicons have taken to write. The eighteenth-century Cambridge scholar John Mall spent ten years on a work still in manuscript in the library of St John's College. Lexicographers depend on their predecessors to an extent not always obvious. The modern standard work, F. W. Danker (ed.), *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Writings* (Chicago and London, 2000) proclaims itself an adaptation of the sixth edition of the Greek–German lexicon of Walter Bauer, but Bauer himself in successive editions from 1928 relied heavily on the 1910 work of Erwin Preuschen. Two following chapters illustrate how long it has taken for definition rather than gloss to find acceptance in NT

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lexicography, and how glossing has been influenced by familiar translations (especially the Authorized Version) in defiance of more accurate or natural English.

NT lexicography originates in the NT itself (e.g. Mark 7.34 glossing *ephphatha*). A fourth-century papyrus glosses in Latin selected words in 2 Corinthians. The survey proper begins with the Complutensian Polyglot NT, in print by 1514. Delayed papal approval allowed Erasmus to steal its thunder with his 1516 edition, but it remains a landmark for including a Greek–Latin alphabetical lexicon. Alphabetical order was abandoned in favour of arrangement by roots in the influential 1619 lexicon by Georg Pasor, but the first Greek–English lexicons (Edward Leigh, 1639; Thomas Cokayne, 1658) reverted to alphabetical order. In 1769 John Parkhurst set a new standard with the only major English lexicon that is not a translation. J. F. Schleusner is known for his 1821 lexicon of the Septuagint (superseded only in 1992) but also produced in 1792 a NT lexicon judged by L. the best thus far. Influential lexicons in the nineteenth century (by Edward Robinson, 1825; S. T. Blomfield, 1840; and others) were derivatives of Greek–Latin works by German scholars: Abraham Wahl, 1822; C. G. Wilke, 1841. There things stood until Deissmann saw the importance of new evidence.

L. is consistently lukewarm about the successive adaptations of Bauer (which have nonetheless given good service) but hails as a breakthrough—'as significant an event as any since 1514'—the appearance of J. P. Louw and E. A. Nida, *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York, 1988). Here the definition method is used in a thoroughgoing way. L. concedes that there are 'faults in execution': some readers may feel he passes over these rather lightly. A chapter on future prospects considers the rôle of an electronic database and the need for the framing of definitions to be a cooperative effort ('one's carefully crafted effort . . . can be punctured in a moment by a glance from a fresh eye').

The case studies offer varied teasers. The belief (traceable to antiquity) that ἀγαπητός means 'only' (son) as well as 'beloved' is shown to lack foundation. Mommsen is always cited for ἀκροατήριον in a legal sense ('hall of justice'), but he simply imported what he took as the sense of *auditorium*. Documentary examples show that the prefix in ἀνατάσσω (famously used in Luke's prologue) need not imply repetition. A diminutive such as γυναικάριον may have no force, or be sympathetic: there is no warrant for the traditional 'weak' or 'silly'. With the technical term δεξιολάβος we should admit agnosticism about both the meaning 'spearman' and its possible derivation from the etymology. Investigation of ἕξις first alerted L. to the 'serial tendency to trust predecessors': long taken as 'practice', it probably means 'mature state'. Idiom and construing are interdependent: κατὰ κράτος normally means 'mightily', but at Acts 19.20 'by the might' is attractive (this rather than ὁ λόγος governing τοῦ κυρίου). Variant readings complicate matters: 'training' for οἰκονομία at 1 Timothy 1.4 is easier to extract from (and surely influenced by) the older reading οἰκοδομία. The notion that πλήν in the sense 'but' is a colloquialism should have been cast into doubt from its concentration in Luke rather than Mark, but this misunderstanding of a German grammarian writing in 1856 has been uncritically repeated ever since. Finally, the Prodigal may indeed have turned his possessions into cash, but συνάγω refers only to the prior stage of gathering them together.

Tonbridge School JOHN TAYLOR
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni266

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni266 Published online by Cambridge University Press