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](#)

Goodwin's *Greek Grammar A Greek Grammar*, by W. W. Goodwin. edition, revised and enlarged. (Macmillan & Co.: London and New York. 1894.)

E. A. Sonnenschein

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 01 / February 1896, pp 66 - 68

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203193, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203193

How to cite this article:

E. A. Sonnenschein (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 66-68 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203193

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tion of the principal parts of verbs according to the formation of the perfect can be called practical, can only be proved by experience. This classified list (§§ 137-167) is supplemented by an alphabetical list at the end of the book.¹ In the matter of 'hidden quantities' the 2nd edition of Marx has been followed 'for the sake of consistency' (Preface).²

That this grammar will be a welcome addition to the scholar's library goes without saying. How far it will be found serviceable in schools is a question on which different teachers would probably give very different answers. The principle on which stress is laid in the prospectus issued by the publishing firm deserves most hearty approval.

¹ Ought the supine of *sto* to be given as *stātum* (with long vowel)? There is no direct evidence for the supine at all, except that Priscian mentions it (with a short vowel); against *-stātūrus*, which alone appears in § 151, we may set the nouns *stātus*, *stābulum*, etc., and the supine of *sisto* (*stātum*).

² It must be remembered however that Marx changed his views upon the quantity of a large number of important words between his first and his second edition.

'Recognizing the importance of familiarity with one grammatical text-book, the authors have endeavoured to make a work that will serve the student from the time he leaves his Latin primer to the very end of his Latin studies.' And if this principle involves the use of a book of considerable size, this disadvantage may be more than counterbalanced by avoidance of the confusion which results from using differently planned books at different stages of learning. Of one thing teachers may feel confident, that in entrusting their pupils to the guidance of Prof. Gildersleeve they are committing them to the hands of a master of grammatical theory and method. It should be added that the book contains a useful list of 138 'Principal Rules of Syntax' (pp. 437-444), and that everything has been done in the way of good print and paper to make the book attractive. The valuable sections on versification (pp. 455-490) present the subject in the light of the best scientific research of the present day.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

GOODWIN'S GREEK GRAMMAR.

A Greek Grammar, by W. W. GOODWIN. New edition, revised and enlarged. (Macmillan & Co.: London and New York. 1894.)

PROFESSOR GOODWIN'S *Greek Grammar* is so well known in England that it would be out of place in discussing the present edition to do more than call attention to changes which have been made since the edition of 1879. The book is now no longer called an *Elementary Greek Grammar*; it consists of 451 pp. (including indices) as compared with 360 pp. in the previous edition (which had no index). The original edition (1870) consisted of only 235 pp. In the Preface Prof. Goodwin says: 'I trust that no one will infer from this repeated increase in the size of the book that I attribute ever increasing importance to the study of formal grammar in school. On the contrary, the growth of the book has come from a more decided opinion that the amount of grammar which should be learned by rote is exceedingly small compared with that which every real student of the Classics must learn in a very different way.'³ 'The chief increase in the

present work has been made in the department of Syntax.' 'One of the most radical changes is the use of 1691 new sections instead of the former 302': i.e. the subject matter of the book is better subdivided—a distinct change for the better.

In the Accidence Goodwin has adopted a more philological and scientific method of treatment on some points, and has gone a certain length in the direction of adopting innovations in the matter of forms.

The N. V. A. dual of πόλις, πῆχυν, etc. is now given as -ει (instead of -εε, as in 1879), and of τριήρης as -ει (instead of -η). This I believe to be an improvement in the light of such evidence as the inscriptions afford (Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, pp. 108, 113, 162, etc.).

In the treatment of the Verb several changes have been made. The verbs in *μ* are now inflected in close connexion with those in *ω*; and 'the old make-shift known as the connecting-vowel has been discarded, and with no misgivings.' The paradigms are still printed without divisions of words, but the sections on tense-formation adopt the analysis into λύο-μεν, λύε-τε, etc. (§ 561; for -ω, -εις, -ει see § 623). The fact that the paradigms of verbs in -μ as well as of verbs in -ω precede the list of personal endings makes

³ That is, as the book is not intended to be learnt by heart, its scope may be extended without danger. Obviously, however, there must be some limit to the scope of a school book.

it possible to give the latter as -μῖ, -ς, -σι; though I am inclined to think that even so the table in this form is likely to prove somewhat of a stumbling-block to beginners.

The old edition gave as the 2nd pers. sing. of the middle and passive λύῃ, λύει; the new edition gives λύει, λύῃ. This seems to be a change for the worse. It is strange to what an extent this particular ending is the victim of fashion: and it would be well for the peace of mind of editors if the question could be definitely settled. Prof. Goodwin (§ 624) says 'ει is the true Attic form, which was used in prose and comedy, but the tragedians preferred η, which is the regular form in other dialects, except Ionic, and in the later common dialect.' This statement seems to attach altogether too much importance to MSS. and editions and to neglect the fact that in inscriptions there is no support for -ει earlier than the fourth century B.C. (Meisterhans, p. 131). Dr. Rutherford's statement (*First Greek Grammar*, § 96) that -η is 'certainly late' seems to invert the facts of the case; it is -ει which is late, and -η, the normal contraction of -εαι (= -εσαι), seems to claim the place of honour for the fifth century.¹

Goodwin accepts Rutherford's conclusion as to the true endings of the pluperfect active (-η, -ης, -ει, instead of -ειν, -εις, -ει, 1879); but not as to those of the aorist optative active; here the place of honour is still given to the short forms in -αις, -αι, in spite of the fact that § 781 declares the 'so-called Aeolic forms' to be 'the common forms in all dialects.' Compare *New Phryn.* p. 436 f. for a list of the very few passages in which -αις, -αι are really supported by evidence. In one passage where -αι has been introduced by conjecture (Aesch. *Eum.* 618 ὁ μὴ κελεύσαι Ζεὺς Ὀλυμπίων πατὴρ: MSS. κελεύσει) the optative appears to me to involve a mistake of syntax as well as a questionable form; read 'κέλευσε. The indic. is demanded in the consecutive relative clause.

¹ Goodwin's note to § 624 (p. 144) is misleading as to the extent to which -η prevails in editions of the classics; one would gather that it was limited to three editors (Kirchhoff, Wecklein, and Bergk). Compare Kühner-Blass, *Greek Gram.* ii. p. 60 (3): 'to introduce this -ει (a mere orthographic variant of the fourth and third century) into the older Attic writers such as Thucydides, Aristophanes, and the tragedians is absurd; in Demosthenes it is indifferent whether one spells in the one way or the other'; the Attic writers of the fourth and third century employed -ει in the 3rd pers. sing. of the pres. indic. as well, and in the dat. sing. of the first declension.

Whether the treatment of verbs in -μῖ side by side with those in -ω is an improvement from the practical point of view I am inclined to doubt. At any rate I think it a mistake to take τίθημι and δίδωμι as typical verbs; they are not types of anything, standing as they do quite alone and being moreover irregular in several important respects. The only typical verbs in -μῖ are ἵστημι (typical of others with stems in α/η) and δείκνυμι.

As to the augment of verbs 'beginning with εἰ and εὐ Goodwin goes some way in the direction of accepting the evidence of the inscriptions (§ 519, cf. § 103 of the ed. of 1879), but not the whole way: see Meisterhans, p. 136, and *New Phryn.* p. 245. Probably he is here guided by the fact that current texts vary so much in forms like ἦρπον, εἶρπον; and doubtless it is a very difficult matter for a grammarian to know how far he can venture to be ahead of his age; but the danger is that if he is not sometimes a little ahead of the texts, the texts may very soon be ahead of him.

To turn to the Syntax: here 'the changes made in the new edition of *Moods and Tenses* have been adopted, so far as is possible in a school-book.' The most important point is perhaps the placing of the independent uses before the dependent; e.g. ἴωμεν before ἵνα ἴδῃ (§ 1320, etc.): this is clearly right. The sections on ὥστε with infin. and indic. (§ 1449 foll.) are improved and the difference of meaning pointed out. In the sections on final clauses μὴ is translated *lest* or *that* (§ 1362, no longer *that not*); but examples not countenanced by the best prose usage are admitted (§ 1365, μὴ προσθώμεθα *lest we add*, instead of ἵνα μὴ προσθώμεθα). The rule about πρίν has been made more accurate (§ 1470), but has at the same time become very complicated and difficult to grasp. The ideal rule about πρίν has still to be worked out: I had hoped to be able in this article to offer some suggestions to this end: but I am not yet satisfied, and must reserve my suggestion for another occasion. The doctrine of conditional sentences is thrown into a somewhat simpler form, but in the main is the same as in the former edition: εἰ πράσσοι is still distinguished from ἐὰν πράσσῃ as 'less vivid' (§ 1387), and ἐὰν πράσσῃ in its turn as 'less vivid' than εἰ πράξει (§ 1405), the fut. indic. being used 'especially in appeals to the feelings, and in threats and warnings.' The last part of the rule reproduces Gildersleeve's 'minatory and monitory conditions.' I have previously raised objections to these three degrees of

'vividness' as meaningless in this connexion, and it would serve no purpose to repeat them here; a better distinction might at any rate have been given for εἰ πράξει. I see no recognition of sentences like the Latin *si fractus illabatur orbis, impavidum ferient ruinae* (admitted as legitimate by Gildersleeve in his new *Latin Grammar*); yet such sentences are by no means uncommon in the best authors;¹ the Greek form is εἰ with the optative in protasis and an indicative without ἄν or an expression of command or

¹ A number of instances is given in the appendix to my *Greek Grammar*, p. 339 f.

wish in the apodosis. The sections on οὐ μὴ (§§ 1360 f.) are slightly altered in wording, but the upshot is identical. A discussion of the *origin* of the construction is wisely withheld.

In conclusion it is evident that no pains have been spared either by the author or the publisher to render this new edition of a well-established book worthy of its position, and those who use it have cause to be grateful to Prof. Goodwin for the labour which he has bestowed upon it.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

SCHANZ ON PLATO'S APOLOGY.

Platonis Apologia. In scholarum usum denovo edidit MARTINUS SCHANZ. 60 Pf. *Sammlung ausgewählter Dialoge Platos mit deutschem Kommentar. Drittes Bändchen. Apologia.* Von Prof. M. SCHANZ. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1893. 3 Mk.

THESE two books are a welcome sign that their editor is again busied with Platonic studies and that the great critical edition commenced in 1875 may be expected to proceed to completion. The text, though brought out as a part of a separate series, 'kritische Separatausgaben für den Schulgebrauch,' is to all intents and purposes a revision of the larger critical edition: a critical text of the *Apology* with collations of BTDPEW and the latest conjectural emendations cannot be said to be dear at 60 Pfennige. On comparing with the earlier edition we find alterations too numerous to mention, some conservative, some of the opposite kind. We notice that 18B μᾶλλον is now omitted with T; formerly it was altered to μὰ τὸν—. Again 31 B εἶχον ἄν, which had been superseded by εἶχεν ἄν, is restored, a decided improvement, and 32 A ἄμα καὶν is now read with Riddell, following Heindorf. On the other hand 17 C ἄν λέγω for ἄ λέγω seems hardly necessary, 'um die Beziehung auf die Zukunft zu erhalten' as the note puts it. The exact force of the ἄν (as laid down in Goodwin *M. and T.* § 520) is to substitute an *indefinite* for a *definite* antecedent, and it is the latter that the context requires. We regret to see [*Ἀναξαγόρου*] still in brackets, 26 D, when all that is wanted is a note of interrogation after λόγων. So too with 35 D πολλοὶ δ' ἐγὼ οὕτως ἔχειν to which is appended

the note: 'B hat δέ. Allein für die unpersönliche Konstruktion kenne ich kein Beispiel bei Plato.' Prof. Schanz surely cannot have forgotten *Prot.* 341 D πολλοὶ γε δέ, ἔφη, οὕτως ἔχειν: to be consistent he must now alter there also, relying on the fact that in the Bodleian δέ stands over an erasure. Yet two such changes accord but ill with Plato's love of variety and freedom of construction.

The commentary is of a high order of excellence. It may be somewhat too advanced for use in schools, but it proceeds on the sound principle thus enunciated: 'die Periode der einseitigen Konjekturealkritik ist vorüber; die in die Tiefe gehende Exegese ist jetzt unsere Aufgabe.' But even more interest attaches to the Introduction of 112 pages, which is divided into eleven chapters and treats the literary questions proposed very fully and thoroughly. The editor is convinced that no one can understand the dialogue until he has decided the question whether it is a report of Socrates' actual speech or a free composition by Plato. Like Riddell and Stock among his English predecessors, he inclines to the latter view, but as he makes no mention (p. 70, n. 3) of their *praeiudicia* we presume he has neglected to get up this part of his case and is unaware how stoutly the opinion, which he champions with all the warmth of a neophyte, has already been maintained. Certainly the first and fourth chapters which deal with Aristophanes' accusation in the *Clouds* would gain from the corresponding section of Riddell's Introduction p. xxii., p. xxviii. *sqq.*, where the imputations of 'the old accusers' are so pertinently opposed to those of Meletus. In