

discussions (a demanding role either not desired by anyone else or so much one man's desire that the others preferred to remain quiet?) Either way, it shows where UB's passion lay. This book can be regarded as an attempt to encompass some aspects of this grand passion but, in the end, the person himself remains admittedly even more plurivocal than the book written about him.

Ulla Lehtonen

GEORG WALSER: *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue. An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*. Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 8. Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm 2001. ISBN 91-22-01928-6. XXV, 197 pp. SEK 433.

This doctoral thesis will be of interest not only to theologians but to all of us who, in Goldhill's words, "need Greek". Many of the issues of diglossia and indeed polyglossia endemic in Ancient Greek from Homer onwards come to head in the period from 200 BC to AD 200 which is particularly under focus in this survey. Basically Walser deals with morphosyntactic convergence, integration, assimilation and code-switching between Hebrew and Greek. It is clear that in the cultural ambience of the synagogue, Hebrew language and ideology would rub off onto Greeks and their linguistic expression. This indeed has been investigated by Krause and the Finnish scholars Aejmelaeus and Soisalon-Soininen. Walser observes a hierarchy of superordination with the Pentateuch having the maximum prestige. Though Septuagint (LXX) specialists talk about the "Hebrew colouring" (Helbing) and "stylistic Hebraism" (Sollamo) of Septuagint Greek, Georg Walser has an obvious penchant for German quotations giving a "German colouring" to his English expression. This book was briefly reviewed by de Lange in *Vetus Testamentum* (2003).

In his introductory first chapter Walser lists the corpora of texts used, one set being synagogue-linked and the other not. In the first set, he restricts his choice to the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judith, Tobit, 1 Maccabees, Daniel, the Apocrypha of Daniel, Apocalypsis Mosis, Joseph and Aseneth, the Testament of Abraham, the Testament of Job, the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, the Gospels, Acts, all Paul's 13 epistles, Revelation, Aristaeus Judaeus, Philo Judaeus, Josephus, and Yadin Papyri. Walser thus omits the Psalms (referred to on p.152), Isaiah, Jeremiah (referred to on p. 101) and most of the prophets. From LXX he omits eg. Esther and 2 Maccabees (referred to in n. 150, p. 34). From the New Testament (NT) he omits Peter's and John's Epistles (referred to in n. 150, p. 34). Walser sides with Thackeray in assuming that the Pentateuch was translated into Greek en bloc though he admits a lack of homogeneity in the different books (p. 10). On the Gentile or secular side are listed Herodotus 2, Xenophon's Anabasis 1–3, Polybius' Histories 1, Diodorus Siculus' Bibliotheca Historica 2, Dionysius Halicarnassensis' Antiquitates Romanae book 1, Dio Chrysostom's 7th, 12th and 36th speeches, Plutarch's Life of Alexander, Epictetus' Dissertations 1–2, and Selected Papyri. One notes that Thucydides and Plato are missing. Walser has collated examples from the TLG-disc and the Accordance programme. For statistical comparison he has used the Mann-Whitney U-tests explained in notes 17 and 19 and repeatedly referred to

throughout the book.

The second chapter on participles is exceptionally long (pp. 18–110), almost half the book. Walser deals with aorist and present participles, but the significant features of these are the surrounding word order and the translation technique of the LXX translators whereby *waw*-consecutive in the Hebrew (And [= *waw*] God said, "Let there be light" and [= *waw*] there was light) is converted into an aorist Greek participle and a finite verb. Readers of the Bible will be familiar with the predicative participle in the nominative case, "saying", "answering" in lieu of the ὅτι recitativum or "that". In Hebrew there is no exact equivalent of the predicative participle, but in Greek they are so frequent that form the basis for statistical comparison.

The participles are thus an apt feature for pinpointing Hebrew influence on the Greek translation because most Greek participles are not translations of Hebrew participles but of other Hebrew verb forms such as finite verbs and infinite absolutes. Further, each Greek participial construction is almost exclusively a translation of one and the same Hebrew expression, retaining however the original word order in the translation. Walser examines first aorist participles of which 492 in the nominative case crop up in the Pentateuch. Tests reveal that there is enormous variation within the Jewish texts. Walser proceeds to look at word order. The frequency of aorist participles being placed after their principal verbs and denoting an event taking place before the one denoted by the principal verb is very low in the Pentateuch. He then proceeds to examine present participles such as λέγων and λαλῶν and a group of participles forming *figurae etymologicae* with the principal verb. 26 texts with the highest frequency of predicative present participles of λέγων are all from the synagogal group. In the Pentateuch and texts with a Semitic Vorlage λέγων is never followed by indirect speech. Again, in synagogal and Pentateuchic texts 50–100% of the predicative present participles in the nominative case of λέγων are placed immediately before direct speech.

Chapter three (pp. 111–122), dealing with conjunctions, is very short. Walser chooses conjunctions that have no equivalent in the Hebrew. In the Pentateuch the principal verb is placed immediately after the conjunctions ἕως, ἡνίκα, ἵνα, μήποτε, ὅπως, ὅτε and ὡστε in 381 out of 423 examples (90%). This percentage is lower in non-synagogal texts. These results correlate with those from the previous chapter.

The fourth chapter (pp. 123–142) treats particles. The usage of emphatic particles during the classical Hellenistic and imperial periods has been investigated by Denniston, Blomqvist and Wahlgren, respectively. Walser concentrates on their occurrence and frequency during the period 200 BC to AD 200. Of emphatic particles the only particle in the Septuagint, the pseudepigrapha and the NT is one example of δῆθεν in *TestAbr. Rec.* 3. The particles are also absent from the papyri. He then turns his attention to γε, δὴ and περ which are rarely used in synagogal texts. Next, Walser looks at particles used with the predicative aorist participles in the nominative case. Martin (*A Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents*, 1974, 19) has observed that Greek which is a translation of Hebrew or Aramaic will have at least two or more καί's for every δέ than in original Greek.

The fifth chapter is a fascinating general discussion of Hebrew influence on the Greek of the ancient synagogue. Walser has already shown that the Pentateuch differs considerably from non-synagogal texts. In this chapter he concentrates on the influence

of the Hebrew original and the translation technique upon the language of the Pentateuch in detail touching upon vocabulary, syntax and Greek word order where ground-breaking research has been carried out by the Finnish scholars Soisalon-Soininen, Sollamo and Aejmelaeus. There is clearly considerable controversy about the role of Alexandrian and Biblical Greek (p. 146). Although it is apparently very difficult to clarify the origin of a Semitism (p. 149), Soisalon-Soininen (*Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*, 1987, 42) has gone so far as to say "Die Sprache der Septuaginta ist in ziemlich grossen Masse Hebräisch mit griechischen Wörtern". At the other end of the scale Conybeare and Stock (*A Grammar of Septuagint Greek*, 1905, 23) maintain: "The language of the Septuagint so far as it is Greek at all, is the colloquial Greek of the Alexandrian market-place, but it is Biblical Greek because it contains so large an element which is not Hellenistic but Semitic". Sparks ("The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 44 [1943] 134), for example, calls Luke "a Septuagintalizer using Septuagintalisms rather than a Semitizer using Semitisms". Though Luke has generally been seen to have copied the LXX language and to have consciously written in what we would call "Biblical" style, Wilcox ("Semitism in the New Testament," *ANRW* II 25,2 [1984] 994) challenges this view since the men of Qumran were accustomed to using a Biblical style of Hebrew. "It is no longer safe to appeal to influence of LXX to explain "Biblical Greek" in the NT – it may after all be genuine." Horrocks speaks only of sporadic Septuagintisms and substrate and translation effect for the Jewish authors/translators involved (*Greek; a History of the language and its Speakers*, 1997, 145 and 175 n. 475).

In the sixth chapter (pp. 174–184) Walser applies Ferguson's more modern concepts of diglossia to his findings, quoting many studies on linguistics, bilingualism and interference between L1 and L2 that resonate with conclusions on spoken interference in Larisa Leisiö's thesis *Morphosyntactic Convergence and Integration in Finland Russian* (2001). Walser would extend L (low)-varieties from spoken Alexandrian Greek in the market-place to sub-species of written text lacking the H (high)-prestige of the Pentateuch. Walser posits a wide continuum ranging from pure Pentateuchal Greek to Greek with little affinity to the Pentateuch. Walser opts definitely for the existence of a distinct Jewish variety of Greek whereas Horsley (*Sociology and the Jesus Movement*, 1989, 5–6) sees the language of the Gospels as being a natural phase in the development of the Hellenistic language, dubbing Jewish Greek a "ghost language" or "a modern fabrication anachronistically imposed on the NT and certain other writings".

Chapter seven (pp. 185–186) is entitled "Concluding Remarks". It is regrettable that Walser concludes his entire opus with a fifty-year-old quotation from Tabachovitz' *Die Septuaginta und das NT: Stilstudien* (1956) who goes on in turn to cite Deissman from 1923! This gives the impression that scholarship has stood still for over fifty or even seventy years.

Walser's research is founded on the work of innumerable scholars who have investigated the Semitic influence on the Greek of the Septuagint and New Testament. He successfully isolates Pentateuchic Greek as being dominant and trend-setting for the translators of other books of the Septuagint. The novelty of his approach (p. 5) is that he starts with LXX and then examines NT, not vice versa as many others have done. He

presupposes that there are differences between the Pentateuch and the non-synagogic texts, mostly in word order. He has tried to identify normal Greek elements that are alien to Hebrew but which are used in the Septuagint due to pressures from the Hebrew Vorlage such as predicative participles and temporal conjunctions. Internal reference and tagging are well handled throughout the book. A peculiar stylistic technique is the author's use of the "royal we" throughout his study. We find this strange! We noticed very small language errors: preferably "an investigation of" rather than "on" in the subtitle; p. 71 2nd line from bottom "are" concerned" rather than "is"; p. 179 "an" entirely homogeneous" rather than "a entirely.." p. 8 "one..and the other" rather than "one and one" (correctly on p. 172). One sentence is repeated in notes 21 and 22 (p. 7). Walser finds it difficult to be succinct often comparing "x" with "non-x" in extended definitions caged with numerous caveats. He has however laid the foundations for further investigations of the Septuagint (ch.2), pointing others in the right direction of more modern sociolinguistics (ch.6).

*Stephen Evans*

WILLIAM STENHOUSE: *Reading Inscriptions and Writing Ancient History. Historical Scholarship in the Late Renaissance*. Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Supplement 86. Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London 2005. ISBN 0-900587-98-9. X, 203 pp. GBP 50.

This book, originally a doctoral dissertation done under the supervision of Michael Crawford, is a fascinating study, interesting and well-written. Its goal is to elucidate how a group of scholars active in Rome in the middle of the sixteenth century redefined the scope and nature of historical writing. Fascinated by the remains of the classical world, and particularly by inscriptions in stone, they began to collect and interpret inscriptions, creating systems of classification and ways of representing their finds that shaped all subsequent attempts to do the same. They then began to question the value of inscriptions as historical sources, and realized that by looking at them as objects – rather than simply as texts written on a particular durable surface – they could extract more information, in particular when they examined the variations in styles of lettering. Thus their work laid the foundations of the modern discipline of epigraphy. But their insights had wider effects: by exploring how artefacts could provide historical information, they expanded the range of sources and subjects that historians could tackle.

The author begins by introducing the subject with an individual, Onofrio Panvinio. To choose him as a starting point might seem perhaps a little bit surprising, as Panvinio was not among the most important scholars in this new florescence of historical and epigraphic studies; moreover, we possess an excellent recent monograph on Panvinio by Jean-Louis Ferrary. On the other hand, it is fitting to begin with him, as he was both an epigrapher and historian, whereas the other great collectors and editors of inscriptions did not always deal thoroughly with historical problems, with a few exceptions like Pighius. In any case, one reads the pages dedicated to Panvinio with interest and profit. We get to know for example that Panvinio was not only living in Rome (rather the contrary), as we have learned from older accounts (for example, W. Henzen in his