

In spite of this critique, the book is a solid commentary on Hebrews, with an inviting presentation and format. It is ideal for college students, whom the author targets for readership.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

ERHARD GALIOS

Lee, John A. L. *A History of New Testament Lexicography*. Studies in Biblical Greek, vol. 8. New York: Peter Lang, 2003. xiv + 414 pp. Paper, \$39.95.

One of the few certainties of life is that a lexicon or dictionary of the language under consideration will furnish the meaning of any word in question. This is especially true in the case of a modern lexicon covering a discrete corpus of literature such as the Greek NT where the words have been studied for centuries. Such volumes are the rock of Gibraltar, the north star to guide scholars as they navigate the biblical text. Until now, no one has systematically traced the history of lexicons for the Greek NT, and the results are surprising. For instance, the author notes that "when Tyndale was preparing his English Translation of the New Testament in 1525, there was no Greek-English lexicon to assist him. A century later when the revisers of 1611 did their work, there was still no such lexicon" (83) in the traditional sense. However, a work lay readily at hand to assist the translator in the form of the Latin Vulgate.

John Lee is well-qualified for the task of narrating the history of NT lexicography. In 1966, he graduated from Cambridge University, and his dissertation was published in 1983 as *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14). He taught classical and Koine Greek at Sydney University for 30 years, and is presently associated with Macquarie University in the same city. He has been working for some time now with Greg Horsley on a replacement volume for Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*.

The book is divided into two parts. Part 1 traces the history of Greek NT lexicons from earliest times to the present. In ancient Greece, lists of words are known to have been compiled (15), perhaps to assist in learning vocabulary. However, credit for the first known, printed Greek lexicon goes to Joannes Crastonus, whose Greek-Latin *Dictionarium graecum* was published in 1478. The first Greek-Latin NT lexicon was printed in 1514 in volume 5 of the *Complutensian Polyglot*. Those who subsequently contributed to the field include Stephanus, Pasor, Leigh, Cockayne, Reyher, Parkhurst, Schleusner, Wilke, Preuschen, Abbot-Smith, Lampe, Bauer, Danker, and Louw and Nida.

In the five centuries since the first lexicon was created, much has been learned about the Greek language—this is especially true during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; however, lexicographers have not kept pace with developments. In chapter 2, Lee suggests that the source of the problem is the failure of lexicographers, except in a few instances, to move beyond the use of simple glosses to definitions (in this context "glosses" are the words in a foreign-language dictionary/lexicon that explain the meaning of the headwords as opposed to providing actual definitions; a "glossary" is a collection of "glosses").

The reason glosses have persisted is not difficult to understand. Most people who use lexicons do so because they want to understand what words in the Greek NT mean. What they expect to find are lists of glosses in the target language that can substitute for the original Greek words. The problem, Lee points out, is while the lexicon user may obtain a translation of NT words, a clear understanding of the underlying Greek language is not attained.

To portray how interrelated most lexicons are, Lee selects a few uncommon words such as δεξιολάβος and ἀύχηρὸς and shows how frequently a gloss provided in one lexicon is repeated uncritically from one lexicon to another, even when the information is demonstrably false. In some instances, he is unable to cite the original source for an incorrect definition. For example, ἔξις (cf. Heb 5:14) is usually glossed as "practice," a definition that Tyndale and Luther brought from the Vulgate. In fact, the word means "mature state," something quite different from the earlier definition, and which materially affects the meaning of the verse (8, 36, 125, 129, 159).

In Lee's estimation, the Louw and Nida NT lexicon is representative of a significant move forward toward what a lexicon should be. Louw and Nida regrouped William Barclay's lexicon semantically into ninety-three domains, according to geographical objects and features; natural substances; and possess, transfer, exchange. Along with these groupings, most words have a definition. As many can testify, simply learning lists of glosses, such as ποιέω ("do," "make"), does not lead to an understanding of the word in all its nuances.

It is interesting to note that the major English lexicons were based on German originals. This is the case both for NT and for classical (i.e., Attic) Greek, for Hebrew and Aramaic, and for the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, edited by Lewis and Short (but not the later *Oxford Latin Dictionary* that was edited by Peter Glare).

From the outset, NT lexicons have consisted of alphabetical lists of the base forms of all the words in the Greek NT, excluding proper nouns in varying degrees. Since most Hebrew words are based on a triconsonantal root, words in a Hebrew lexicon are usually listed alphabetically by root. No such schema is utilized in the standard NT lexicons, though some have experimented with similar arrangements over the centuries.

The second part of the book is a series of twelve word studies, which illustrate the principles called for in the first part of the book. My personal favorite is πλῆν. In no less an authority than Frederick Danker's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, it is stated, on the authority of Schmid, that "πλῆν rather than ἀλλά is the real colloq. word for this idea, so in Mt and Lk but not in Ac" (311). Lee traces the notion first to Bauer's earliest revision and then to Preuschen; but, as seen, Schmid is quoted as the source. However, Schmid, in turn, quotes Mullach. But, as it turns out, the latter is actually commenting on Modern Greek, not Koine Greek (312-315). Nor is reference to Schmid confined to the Preuschen-Bauer-Danker family of lexicons. My first Greek lexicon was that of Abbott-Smith, and Schmid is quoted there as well. As Lee observes: "The likelihood

is that πλὴν for ἀλλά . . . was actually a mark of a *more* pretentious style, the opposite of what our present-day authorities and their predecessors for more than a century have been saying” (315).

Lee also provides lists of NT lexicons, works not included as lexicons, and older lexicons; a general bibliography; four appendices; and three indices including Greek words, ancient sources, and modern names.

This book addresses what, at first, might appear to be an issue of little moment. After all, scholars and students have been able to use existing lexicons to read and understand the Greek NT. The problem is that the process of substituting English glosses for Greek words is not really translating. What is needed is a feel for the language. Definitions are a significant advance in facilitating this process.

If the volume were simply to have chronicled the history of NT lexicon making, it would have been helpful. In fact, the book is much more than this. It lays out an agenda for the twenty-first century by one who is intimately involved in a similar work of updating Moulton and Milligan. Thus it is required reading for the whole gambit of NT scholars: first, those working in any direct way with the Greek text and using any sort of lexicon to understand it; second, for those using a translation. Third—and perhaps the most importantly—the book provides guidelines for any scholar contemplating creating or updating a lexicon for the Greek NT. Should that not be sufficient motivation to read the book, be aware that NT lexicons have inherent limitations, and are to be used with caution for the reasons indicated in this book.

Loma Linda, California

BERNARD A. TAYLOR

Lucas, Ernest. *Daniel*. *Apollos Old Testament Commentary*, 20. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002. 359 pp. Hardcover, \$34.95.

The purpose of the newly launched *Apollos Old Testament Commentary* series is to provide a combination of excellent exegetical analysis and insightful elucidation of the contemporary significance of the text. The volume on *Daniel* by Ernest Lucas, vice-principal and tutor in biblical studies at Bristol Baptist College in England, is the second in the series and fulfills this task description extremely well.

The commentary is divided into introduction, text and commentary, and epilogue. In the introduction, Lucas provides, first, a brief overview of the text, the different versions, and the major guidelines for the text-critical study of *Daniel*. The main section of the introduction deals with the methodology of interpretation of the stories in Dan 1–6 and of the visions in Dan 7–12. Lucas stresses the importance of genre awareness in understanding both. While in line with the usually held position (Lucas accepts the stories as court tales, distinguishing between tales of court contest [Dan 2; 4; 5] and tales of court conflict [Dan 3; 6]), he does not exclude the possibility of their historical character: “fiction and truth are not mutually exclusive” (27). The story in Dan 1,